THE
KASHI SANSKRIT SERIES
(*HARIDAS SANSKRIT GRANTHAMALA*)
61
(Alaṅkāra S'āstra Section No. 2.)

KĀVYĀLAṄKĀRA

of

BHĀMAHA

Edited With Introduction etc.

By

Batuk Nāth S'armā, M.A., Sāhityopādhyāya,
and
Baldeva Upādhyāya, M.A., Sāhitya S'āstri,
PROFESSORS, BENARES HINDU UNIVERSITY.

WITH A FOREWORD
By

Principal A. B. Dhruva, M.A., LL.B.,
Pro-Vice-Chancellor, Benares Hindu University.

PRINTED, PUBLISHED & SOLD BY
Jai Krishna Das Hari Das Gupta
The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office,
Vidya Vilas Press, North of Gopal Mandir, Benares City.

1928.

Printed-Published & sold by
JAI KRISHNADAS-HARIDAS GUPTA,
The Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office,
VIDYA VILAS PRESS,
North of Gopal Mandir,
BENARES CITY.

Printed by Jai Krishna Das Gupta
at the Vidya Vilas Press, Benares.

Agents:

1 Luzac & co, Booksellers,
LONDON.

2 Otto Harrassowitz, Leipzig:
GERMANY.

3 The Oriental Book-supplying Agency,
POONA.

हरिदाससंस्कृतग्रन्थमालासमाख्य-
काशीसंस्कृतसीरिज़पुस्तकमालायाः
६१
अलङ्कारशास्त्रविभागे(२)द्वितीयपुष्पम् ।

काव्यालङ्कारः

श्रीभामहाचार्येण विनिर्मितः

काशीविश्वविद्यालयाध्यापकाभ्यां
पण्डित बटुकनाथ शर्म्मा एम. ए. साहित्योपाध्यायः
तथा
पण्डित बलदेव उपाध्याय एम. ए. साहित्यशास्त्री
इत्येताभ्यां भूमिकादिभिः समलङ्कृत्य
सम्पादितः
काशीविश्वविद्यालयोपकुलपतिपदं विभूषयद्भिः श्रीमदाचार्यप्रवरैः
आनन्दशङ्करध्रुवमहोदयैः
लिखितेन प्राक्कथनेन सनाथीकृतः

प्रकाशकः —
जयकृष्णदास—हरिदासगुप्तः—
चौखम्बा संस्कृत सीरिज आफिस, विद्याविलास प्रेस.
गोपालमंदिर के उत्तरफाटक, बनारस सिटी ।

१९८५

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

I have much pleasure in contributing a brief Foreword to this edition of Bhāmahālaṁkāra which my young colleagues-Pandit Batuknath S'arma and Pandit Baldeva Upadhyaya-have prepared for the Kashi Sanskrit Series. As is well-known this work was first published many years ago as an appendix in Mr. K.P.Trivedi's edition of the Pratāparudra-Yaśobhūṣaṇa in the Bombay Sanskrit Series. But considering its interesting contents and the place of Bhāmaha in the history of Indian Poetics, it was rather strange that no Indian scholar or publisher should have thought of bringing it out, until now, as a separate volume.

The editors of this new publication have fitted up the text with an exhaustive Introduction, in which they have reviewed all the existing literature relating to the religion, date and works of Bhāmaha. The controversies, which arose almost immediately after the publication of Mr. Trivedi's Appendix, were soon lost in the din of the battle which raged fiercely round the " Plays of Bhāsa ". But since the latter has now subsided, at least for the time being, the Bhāmaha problems have a chance of being taken up again and carried nearer the solution if possible.

WAS BHĀMAHA A BUDDHIST ?

It may readily be admitted that the word सर्वज्ञ occurring in the maṅgalācharaṇa of Kāvyālaṁkāra may mean " S'iva " as the word is one of the synonyms of the god according to Amarakoṣa. Moreover, if the source of Amara's statement be

investigated, it will probably be found in the religio-philosophical system in which the Omniscient God of the Nyāyadarśana was identified with the S'iva of S'aiva Âgama. Nevertheless, it may be pertinent to inquire whether the word is used, in any of the maṅgalācharaṇas which we know of, in a sense other than that of Jina or Buddha, which, too, are recognised senses of the word. The argument, based on the character of Bhāmaha's illustrations which is advanced by Mr. Kane and some others and is endorsed by the present editors, does not carry conviction, for a similar use of Brahmanical literature is made by Hemachandra in his Kāvyānuśāsana despite the author being a redoubtable Jaina. The single consideration which appears to weigh most and militate strongly against Bhāmaha being supposed to be a Buddhist is the manner in which he criticises the doctrine of Apoha. This doctrine is, no doubt, Buddhistic. But is it an essential part of Buddhism ? At most, its rejection would only show—in view of Bhāmaha's obeisance to Buddha in the maṅgalācharaṇa—that he was an incomplete Buddhist who did not care for this particular tenet of Buddhistic logic. As a matter of fact, however, Apohavāda was a special theory of the school of Dignāga which, as noted by Prof. Stcherbatsky, was not accepted by the Mādhyamikas (See Stcherbatsky's footnote on pp 155–56 of his translation of Candrakīrti's Mādhyamikavṛtti " given in his valuable monograph on " The Conception of Buddhist Nirvāṇa".). The ground being thus cleared for regarding Bhāmaha as a Buddhist, the view suggested by the reference to " Sarvajña "

in the maṅgalācharaṇa may be corroborated by the fact that the only definitions of Pratyakṣa cited by Bhāmaha, Kāvyālaṁkāra Ch. V, are those which are indisputably Buddhistic, viz. those formulated by Vasubandhu and Dignāga. I do not refer to the nature of Inference and the classification of Fallacies mentioned in that chapter as evidence pointing to the same direction, as it is still a matter of controversy among scholars whether this contribution to Logic is exclusively Buddhistic. Personally I think it is not, but the problem is too difficult to be solved or even attempted in the short space of a Foreword. But it is impossible to overlook the fact the pramāṇas are stated by Bhāmaha to be two–Pratyakṣa and Anumāna only–which is particularly in conformity with the view of Buddhist logicians. It may be argued on the other hand that the doctrine, although long known and recognised as Buddhistic, was held at one time by the Vaiśeṣikas also. But it should be noted that this was no longer so after Buddhism came into sharp conflict with Brahmanism, that is, in the centuries which followed the downfall of the Asokan Empire, and especially during the period to which Bhāmaha could possibly be assigned. Moreover, if, as Stcherbatsky now holds, Praśastapāda is to be placed before Dignāga and consequently before Bhāmaha, it becomes incredible that the doctrine of two pramāṇas accepted by Bhāmaha should be a Vaiśeṣika doctrine, Praśastapāda having developed the system already into one of four pramāṇas. To me the whole of the logic contained in chapter V seems to have been exactly

what it professes to be, namely 'हेतुन्यायलवोच्चयः' that is, a work 'condensed and collected' from some regular work or works on Logic, which judging from the form and the contents appear to be those of Dignāga, S'aṅkarasvāmin or Dharmakīrti.

The question of the date of Bhāmaha bristles with problems too numerous and intricate to be discussed satisfactorily in the short space of a Foreword. A few observations on some of them may, however, be attempted :

Let us take the question of the relative chronology of BHĀMAHA AND KALIDĀSA—

We read in the Meghadūta of Kālidāsa :—

धूमज्योतिःसलिलमरुतां सन्निपातः क्व मेघः
सन्देशार्थाः क्व पटुकरणैः प्राणिभिः प्रापणीयाः ।
इत्यौत्सुक्यादपरिगणयन् गुह्यकस्तं ययाचे
कामार्ता हि प्रकृतिकृपणाश्चेतनाचेतनेषु ॥

and in Bhāmaha's Kāvyālaṅkāra :—

अयुक्तिमद्यथा दूता जलभृन्मारुतेन्दवः etc.

This raises the interesting problem of the priorty or posteriority of Bhāmaha to Kālidāsa. After reproducing the arguments of those who place Kālidāsa before Bhāmaha and of those who do vice versa, the editors conclude with the remark : "Taking the arguments from both sides into consideration we may confess that much can be said on both sides and that nothing is really settled." If I may express my opinion on the point, I may say that I have not the least doubt that Kālidāsa preceded Bhāmaha. To the unromantic mind of the latter, the Dūtakāvyas appear at first 'अयुक्तिमत्', that is, irrational, but he soon remembers

Kālidāsa's line :—

इत्यौत्सुक्यादपरिगणयन् गुह्यकस्तं ययाचे etc.

and consequently modifies his sweeping objection by the remark :—

यदि चोत्कण्ठया यत्तदुन्मत्त इव भाषते ।
तथा भवतु भूम्नेदं सुमेधोभिः प्रयुज्यते ॥

Here यदि चोत्कण्ठया etc. is a distinct recollection of इत्यौत्सुक्याद् etc. and Kālidāsa is evidently one of the "सुमेधसः" referred to in the observation "भूम्नेदं सुमेधोभिः प्रयुज्यते".

BHĀMAHA AND DAṆḌIN—

This question has been adequately discussed by Mr. Kane in his History of Alaṁkāra Literature prefixed to his edition of the Sāhityadarpaṇa. Therein after fully setting forth and examining the arguments of the two parties, he concludes as follows "Whoever may be earlier both are very near each other and are to be placed between 500 and 630 A. C. If, however, it be said that from the materials collected above one must be held to be borrowing from or criticising the other, then I would declare myself in favour of Daṇḍin's priority over Bhāmaha. I hold that the reasons assigned for Daṇḍin's priority are more weighty (though not decisive) than those assigned for Bhāmaha's priority." But the majority of the scholars who have written upon this subject hold the opposite view, and personally I share with the editors the opinion of those who place Bhāmaha before Daṇḍin. In Ch. V of his work Bhāmaha thus justifies the place of शास्त्र in poetry and poetics :

स्वादुकाव्यरसोन्मिश्रं शास्त्रमप्युपयुञ्जते ।
प्रथमालीढमधवः पिबन्ति कटु भेषजम् ॥

On the other hand, Daṇḍin says :

प्रतिज्ञाहेतुदृष्टान्तहानिर्दोषो न वाच्यसौ ।
विचारः कर्कशः प्रायस्तेनालीढेन किं फलम् ॥

Mr. Kane refuses to believe that the latter is intended as a criticism of the former, for he says, "It is more than doubtful whether, if Daṇḍin had the whole of the 5th Pariccheda of Bhāmaha before him and was in a fighting mood, he would have let off Bhāmaha with such a mild and suave remark "तेनालीढेन किं फलम् ।" I do not see why Daṇḍin should be 'in a fighting mood', when he could analyse the metaphor of his opponent and show that it did not support his case ? Cover your "विचार" which is a hard nut with as much 'रस' as you can, it will still cut your mouth, says Daṇḍin in reply to Bhāmaha. Is 'विचार' ever said to be 'आलीढ' ? Does not this unusual word–unusual in its use with 'विचार'–seem to have been taken from Bhāmaha ? Does it not, moreover, clearly imply a metaphor of 'मधु' ? If so, what could Daṇḍin have possibly had in his mind except the line of Bhāmaha–"प्रथमालीढमधवः पिबन्ति कटु भेषजम्" ? To me Daṇḍin's line appears to have made a crushing reply to Bhāmaha.

BHĀMAHA AND DHARMAKĪRTI :—

Lastly, Dr. Jacobi holds that Bhāmaha is posterior to Dharmakīrti, the former having borrowed certain logical definitions and expressions in ch. V. of his Kāvyālaṁkāra from the latter. Against this the editors are right in urging that the reference to त्रिरूपलिङ्ग in the त्रिरूपाल्लिङ्गतो ज्ञानम् (Kāvyālaṁkāra ch. V, II) does not prove Jacobi's case, since the doctrine of लिङ्गत्रैरूप्य can be traced to Dignāga and

was probably older. I have discussed the whole problem of the relation of Buddhist with the Brāhmaṇa Nyāya in the Introduction to my edition of the "Nyāyapraveśa" which is now in the press, and consequently refrain here from a detailed examination of this particular question. However, there are three other parallels which cannot be explained away quite so easily: one is "प्रत्यक्षमनुमा च ते (प्रमाणे)। असाधारणसामान्यविषयत्वं तयोः किल" in Kāvyālaṁkāra, corresponding to similar statements in the Nyāyabindu. No doubt the doctrines of स्व(असाधारण)लक्षण and सामान्यलक्षण did not originate with Dharmakīrti. But have they been put forth by any earlier logician to bring out the distinction between Pratyakṣa and Anumāna in the way Bhāmaha and Dharmakīrti have done? Moreover, it is to be remembered that the question here is not whether a particular thought existed before the time of Dharmakirti or Bhamaha, but whether it has been expressed in the same way. There are two other passages cited by Jacobi–Dharmakīrti's 'दूषणानि न्यूनताद्युक्तिः' corresponding to 'दूषणं न्यूनताद्युक्तिः' of Bhāmaha, and the former's 'दूषणाभासास्तु जातयः,' corresponding to the latter's 'जातयो दूषणाभासाः'। Here there is, as the editors admit, 'a striking similarity of language' which it is difficult to explain except on the hypothesis of one borrowing from the other. Consequently they suggest that of the two Dharmakīrti may have been the borrower. But is this probable? Is Bhāmaha known as a logician? Does he not himself say that he has only "collected" his logical statements ("हेतुन्यायलवोच्चयः'')? In view of this, the passage in the Ânanda-

vardhana's "Dhvanyāloka" on which the editors rely for proving the priority of Bhāmaha to Bāṇa and therefore to Dharmakīrti must be set aside as untrustworthy or explained away if possible. I think the latter is not impossible. The passage which is found as III. 28 of Bhāmaha's Kāvyālaṁkāra is not ascribed by Ânandavardhana to Bhāmaha by name, and possibly the verse in question is a quotation from an earlier writer for illustrating the particular alaṁkāra "**तुल्ययोगिता**". A possible objection based on Bhāmaha's own statement in II. 96 that the illustrations were his own composition, is met conclusively by Mr. Kane who quotes many facts to the contrary, Moreover, the passage under consideration occurs in Chapter III and not in II.

These are just a few of the many interesting date-problems which have arisen in connection with Bhāmaha and which have received full treatment at the hands of the present editors. I have much pleasure in commending their work to the attention of Sanskrit Scholars.

A. B. DHRUVA.

I.—BHĀMAHA AND HIS KĀVYĀLANKĀRA.

By Batuk Nath Sarma and Baldeva Upādhyāya.

Preliminary.

In every age, in every clime, the importance of an author is weighed on the scales of utility by the coming posterity. Plato and Aristotle command no inconsiderable recognition and deference even now—in the age which has seen cultural progress in almost all directions. This is so, not only for the reason that their works were of the highest order, but also because they were made much use of by the generations coming after them. So it seems that in order to gauge the merits of a particular author we should betake ourselves to the consideration of the kind of fame which that author has had the good fortune to call his own.

Importance of भामह

Let us now turn to our own author and see whether he can stand the test successfully. Even a desultory student of Sanskrit Poetics can bear testimony to the fact that there are a few famous names of old eminent authors which no later writer on the subject could afford to ignore without sacrificing his own high ambition of celebrity. One of these such names is indeed that of भामह. As far as we know, there is no important work on Poetics which does not refer to भामह and his work in some way or other. His work has been very frequently drawn upon for quotations by almost all the important writers of Sanskrit Poetics. There are some who have even borrowed from his works 'matter' and sometimes phraseology. In the body of discussions he has been referred to as an authority of necessary recognition. Even those who could not manage to agree with him on certain points have shown due deference to his views. He has been commanding this respect from Sanskrit poets and poeticians, not for a century

or two, but for a very large number of centuries. The name which seems to have been most associated with the science of poetics from its early infancy (with the only exception of भरत) is that of भामह. He is indeed the oldest आलङ्कारिक and in fact one of the most authoritative ones whose work has come down to us.

Not only the old writers of India have had much to do with भामह and his work, even the modern scholars of vast erudition and wide reputation, have been attracted towards him. There was a time when a regular warfare was going on, with regard to the date and personality of भामह, among some of the leaders of Oriental Research in India, in which some western scholars of note also took part. Though nothing perfectly quite definite was arrived at, still much was written which shed new light on some obscure corners of historical investigation.

A Brief Survey of Discussions on भामह

It would not be out of place to take here a very brief survey of the various problems raised and discussed with regard to भामह along with the conclusion reached by way of their solutions. Though, as noted above, भामह's name was to be heard everywhere among scholars, his work was not at first available anywhere. Bühler, not finding any trace of भामह's work, inferred, with the inevitable disappointment of a real scholar, that the work had been lost for over.[1] In 1880, however, a MS of the work came to the notice of Gustav Oppert but we could not know much from his description.[2] In his memorable list of works on Sanskrit Poetics, Jacob noted the काव्यालङ्कार of भामह also,[3] but even this mention

1. Bühler's Kāśhmir Report, 1877.
2. List of Sanskrit MSS. in private Libraries of Southern India, Vol. I. No. 3731.
3. J. R. A. S. 1897-8.

was not of much use. In the edition of a certain Kanarese work[1] on Poetics, Mr. K. B. Pathak also took notice of this work but it was only in passing and had nothing directly to do with it. The first person to give publicity to भामह's work and to make definite statements about him, was R. Narsimhachar of Bangalore. In the Introduction to his edition of a Kannada work[2] on Poetics he observed—" Next to him (Bhārata) in point of time, comes Bhāmaha whose priority to Daṇḍin is proved by the latter criticising his views in the first chapter of Kāvyādarśa. He is one of the greatest authorities on Poetics, his view being quoted by almost all the subsequent writers of note on the subject............Prof. Rangacharya M.A. of the Madras Presidency College has had the good fortune to come upon the manuscript of the valuable and long-sought-after work......The work bears no date but the author probably belongs to the early part of the 6th century." But as this was written in the Introduction of a Kannada work, it could not naturally come to the notice of most of the Sanskrit scholars.

It was only when Mr. M. T. Narsinhiengar wrote an article on भामह that the attention of Sanskrit scholars was drawn towards the great rhetorician[3]. Mr. Narsimhiengar raised almost all those issues which engaged the attention of Indologists for a long time later on. He thought that भामह was a Buddhist and flourished after दण्डी. Dr. Barnett, in that very year, wrote a note, supporting Mr. Narsimhiengar that भामह belonged to the first half of the 8th century[4]. Mr. P. V. Kāṇe tried to refute

---

1. कविराजमार्ग edt. by K. B. Pathak, 1898.
2. काव्यावलोकनम् by नागवर्मा, edt. by R. Narsimhachar, 1903.
3. J. R. A. S., 1905, p. 535 ff.
4. J. R. A. S., 1905, p. 841.

Mr. Narsimhiengar's hypothesis that भामह was a Buddhist, but as regards his date, he agreed with him[1] In 1909 विद्यानाथ's प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण was published by Mr. K P. Trivedi in the Bombay Sanskrit Series. In an 'Appendix' to this work, भामह's काव्यालङ्कार appeared in print for the first time. Mr. Trivedi, in his learned Introduction, dealt with many questions in connection with भामह. His arguments were mainly directed against the views of Mr. Narsimhiengar. Dr. Jacobi[2] and Prof. Rangacharya[3] in 1910 and Mr. Anantacharya[4] in 1911 joined issue and mainly agreed with Mr. Trivedi. Mr. R. Narsimhachar (the first person to give publicity to the discovery of भामह's work) added some new arguments to those already advanced in favour of the priority of भामह to दण्डी. [5]In the same year Mr. K. B. Pathak tried in a learned paper to refute many of the arguments put forward against him[6]. But his refutations, as shown by Mr. Trivedi the very next year, were as unconvincing as they were learned[7]. This paper of Mr. Trivedi seems to have silenced his opponents, and for a number of years nothing new was added to this important discussion. In 1922, Dr. Jacobi, with his characteristic insight in all matters connected with Indology, suggested a new line of approach to the determination of भामह's date (as did also Mr. P. V. Kane, quite independently of Dr. Jacobi). He tried to prove that भामह had borrowed much from धर्मकीर्ति and that consequently he must be

---

1. J. R. A. S., 1908, p. 543.
2. Z. D. M. G., 1910.
3. Introduction to काव्यादर्श, 1910.
4. Brahmavadin, 1911.
5. Ind. Ant., 1912, p. 90 ff.
6. Int. Ant., 1912, p. 232 ff.
7. Ind. Ant., 1913.

placed after him[1]. To many this view appeared to be the last word in the discussion on the date of भामह. Dr. De[2] and others[3] seem to have followed in the foot-steps of Jacobi.

The last few years have seen a marked progress towards the study of Sanskrit Poetics and a few very valuable works have appeared on the subject. Mr. P. V. Kane deserves all praise for his intensive study and extensive researches[4]. Dr. S. K. De also is entitled to an especial mention. He has rendered a valuable service to the cause of the study of the History of Sanskrit Poetics by his useful work[5]. Dr. Nobel's recently published book[6] and Mr. B. N. Bhattacharya's paper[7] are also not to be lost sight of.

In spite of so much writing, no attempt has so far been made to see if it is possible to throw any new light on the subject nor even to sum up in one place all that has been written before. भामह's work itself has till now been lying in a neglected condition in an obscure corner of प्रतापरुद्र-यशोभूषण ।

An attempt is, therefore, being made here to present within the limits of a brief paper every information hitherto available regarding भामह and his work, and in course of this presentation, to examine critically the current theories and to see if any of them is compatible with the date

---

1. Sitzungberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp. 211–12.
2. History of Sanskrit Poeties, Vol. 1, p. 48.
3. Nobel.—Foundations of Indian Poetry, p. 17.
4. Introduction to his edition of साहित्यदर्पण, Bombay, 1923.
5. History of Sanskrit Poetries, 2 Vols., 1923.
6. Foundations of Indian Poetry, Calcutta, 1925.
7. Calcutta Journal of Letters, Vol. IX.

recently brought to light. It is to be earnestly hoped that this humble attempt on our part will again remind the veteran scholars of their old friend भामह and will probably help to create for them a new interest in him.

भामह—WHO AND WHAT HE WAS

We know very little with regard to भामह except what we find revealed in his काव्यालङ्कार. Tradition says that he was a Kashmirian, and this is believed in by Bühler[1] and others[2]. There is no reason to disbelieve it even though we have no reasonable evidence—external or internal—to prove it beyond doubt. From the last śloka[3] of his काव्यालङ्कार, we learn that his name was भामह and that he was the son of रक्रिलगोमिन्. The word रक्रिल, which bears phonetic resemblance to राहुल, पोत्तल, सोमिल and similar other Buddhist names, is alleged to suggest Buddhistic associations; and this suggestion would seem to gain strength from a consideration of the term गोमिन् which is reminiscent of the name of one of Buddha's disciples[4]. Mr. Pathak has shown that the word गोमिन् used to carry with it an idea of reverence[5]. He refers to a sutra of the चान्द्रव्याकरण[6] where the word is expressly stated to convey such a sense. Moreover, the word सार्वसर्वज्ञ which occurs in the opening śloka[7] of भामह's work,

---

1. Bühler's Kashmir Report, p. 64.
2. Narsimhachar in his Introduction to नागवर्मा's काव्यावलोकनम् Ind. Ant., 1912.
   Krishnamacharya : History of Classical Sanskrit Literature.
3. अवलोक्य मतानि सत्कवीनामवगम्य स्वधिया च काव्यलक्ष्म ।
   सुजनावगमाय भामहेन ग्रथितं रक्रिलगोमिसूनुनेदम् ॥ काव्या॰ VI, 64.
4. J. R. A. S., 1905
5. Ind. Ant., 1912.
6. 'गोमिन् पूज्ये', 4. II. 144.
7. प्रणम्य सार्वं सर्वज्ञं मनोवाक्कायकर्मभिः ।
   काव्यालङ्कार इत्येष यथाबुद्धि विधास्यते ॥ काव्या-I. I.

cannot but point, so it is said, to the Buddha himself. The word सार्व in its derivative meaning stands quite in correspondence with the doctrine of universal love taught by Buddha. हेमचन्द्र[1] gives सार्व as one of the names of जिन. जिनदेवमुनीश्वर[2] does exactly the same thing, except that he adds to the list of the synonyms the name सर्वीय In view of the well known fact that several Buddhist names were adopted by the Jains, one might feel justified in inferring from these Jain references that सार्व was originally an epithet of the Buddha. The use of the word सर्वज्ञ for Buddha[3] is, of course, well known.

Now taking these points into consideration, we may at once confess that the arguments, stated above for proving भामह to be a Buddhist, do not by themselves stand on a very firm ground. As says Mr. Kāṇe, there is not much in a name.[4] When the Hindus and the Buddhists had been living in the same country for centuries and centuries together, there is no wonder if one borrowed the name of the other. When this fact is found to be possible even in the case of such heterogenous peoples as the Hindus and the Mahomedans, it is even more possible in the case of the Hindus and the Buddhists. Moreover, we are to remember that Buddha himself had come to be recognised as an अवतार of विष्णु, certainly before the 11th century. With Trivedi, we may add that the word गोमिन् is not exclusively used for the Buddhists. It is explained by the नैघण्टुकs as a contraction of गोस्वामिन्. It is a caste designation added after the names of the Brāhmaṇas

1. अभिधान चिन्तामणि, I,1, 25.
2. अभिधान चिन्ताशिलोञ्छ.
3. सर्वज्ञः सुगतो बुद्धः—अमरकोश
4. Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, p. XVIII.

throughout Kashmir and Northern India and corresponds to the आचार्य of the South.[1]

An author's religion may perhaps be judged from the contents of his book, but not from his name. In the whole of काव्यालङ्कार there is nothing peculiarly Buddhistic, nor is there any reference to the incidents of Buddha's life or to any purely Buddhistic legends. The first verse, no doubt, salutes सार्व सर्वज्ञ but the appellation सार्व simply means सर्वस्मै हित[2] and is not given by any lexicographer as meaning Buddha exclusively. The word सर्वज्ञ is found in lexicons standing for Buddha as well as for Śiva[3]. कुमारिल in his श्लोकवार्तिक devotes a long section to the refutation of "सर्वज्ञ", where he means by the term "Omniscient God" and not "Buddha." It is a significant fact that अमरसिंह, who was himself a Buddhist, does nowhere give the word सार्व for Buddha in his अमरकोश ।

The अपोहवाद of the Buddhists, which represents their theory of verbal connotation, is criticised by भामह in a language which cannot be considered possible for a Buddhist[4] writer.

---

1. See Trivedi's Introduction to प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण p. xxxvii.
2. हितप्रकरणे णं च सर्वशब्दात् प्रयुञ्जते ।
   ततश्छमिष्टया च यथा सार्वः सर्वीय इत्यपि ॥
   काव्या०—VI, 53.
   Cf. पाणिनि ' सर्वपुरुषाभ्यां णढञौ ' V. 1. 10. also.
3. कृशानुरेताः सर्वज्ञो धूर्जटिर्नीललोहितः-अमरकोश.
4. अन्यापोहेन शब्दोऽर्थमाहेत्यन्ये प्रचक्षते ।
   अन्यापोहश्च नामान्यपदार्थापाकृतिः किल ॥
   यदि गौरित्ययं शब्दः कृतार्थोऽन्यनिराकृतौ ।
   जनको गवि गोबुद्धेर्मृग्यतामपरो ध्वनिः ॥
   काव्या°—VI, 16-17.

He speaks of Vedic rites and ceremonies in very high terms. The kings who drank Soma are highly spoken of[1]. Most of his examples refer to Brahmanical gods[2] and heroes. The famous Paurāṇic legend of the burning of **काम** by **शिव** has been referred to by **भामह** in very clear terms[3]. He very frequently alludes to the characters and incidents of **रामायण.** The meeting of **राम** with **परशुराम**[4], his exile to the forest of **दण्डक** in obedience to the orders of his father[5], his piercing with a single arrow the seven **ताल** trees[6], the promise of **हनुमान्** to search out the whereabouts of **सीता**[7]—these are some of the famous incidents of **रामायण** mentioned by **भामह** in his **काव्यालङ्कार.**

---

1. भूभृतां पीतसेामानां न्याय्ये वर्त्मनि तिष्ठताम् ।
   अलङ्करिष्णुना वंशं गुरौ सति जिगीषुणा ॥ काव्या०-IV.48.
2. युगादौ भगवान् ब्रह्मा विनिर्मित्सुरिव प्रजाः । काव्या०-II.55 b.
   समग्रगगनायाममानदण्डेा रथाङ्गिनः ।
   पादेा जयति सिद्धस्त्रीमुखेन्दुनवदर्पणः ॥ काव्या०-III. 36.
   विदधानौ किरीटेन्दू श्यामाभ्रहिमसच्छवी ।
   रथाङ्गशूले बिभ्राणौ पातां वः शम्भुशार्ङ्गिणौ ॥ काव्या०-IV.21.
   कान्ते इन्दुशिरोरत्ने आदधाने उदंशुनी ।
   पातां वः शम्भुशर्वाण्यौ............॥ काव्या०-IV.27.
3. स एकस्त्रीणि जयति जगन्ति कुसुमायुधः ।
   हरतापि तनुं यस्य शम्भुना न हृतं बलम् । काव्या०-III. 25.
4. अत्याजयद्यथा रामः सर्वक्षत्रवधाश्रयाम् ।
   जामदग्न्यं युधा जित्वा सा ज्ञेया केापबाधिनी ॥ काव्या०-V.44.
5. उदात्तशक्तिमान् रामेा गुरुवाक्यानुरेाधकः ।
   विहायेापनतं राज्यं यथा वनमुपागमत् ॥ काव्या०-III. 11.
6. रामः सप्ताभिनत् तालान् । काव्या०-III. 32.
7. उपलप्स्ये स्वयं सीतामिति भर्तृनिदेशतः ।
   हनूमता प्रतिज्ञाय सा ज्ञातेत्यर्थसंश्रया ॥ काव्या०-IV. 37.

The references to the characters and incidents of महाभारत are far more numerous than those of रामायण. Almost all the important characters of महाभारत are found mentioned[1]. The promise of पुरु to suffer the miseries of old age in lieu of his father[2], and that of भीष्म for the life of a perfect celibate[3], have been alluded to by भामह, while illustrating different types of प्रतिज्ञा. Similarly, the gambling duel of युधिष्ठिर and शकुनि,[4], the terrible determination and performance of the drinking of दुःशासन's blood[5], and many other incidents[6] are also referred to. In a truly beautiful śloka, भामह describes the feeling of excessive joy expressed by विदुर on कृष्ण's arrival at his house[7]. In another śloka, the name of प्रद्युम्न, the son of कृष्ण, is found coupled with that of ऐल पुरूरवा, the progenitor of the lunar dynasty of Kṣatriyas[8].

---

1. See भामह's काव्यालङ्कार, III. 7, V. 31, V. 41.
2. जरामेष विभर्मीति प्रतिज्ञाय पितुर्यथा
   तथैव पुरुणाभारि सा स्याद्धर्मनिबन्धिनी ॥ V. 36.
3. अद्यारभ्य निवत्स्यामि मुनिवद् वचनादिति
   पितुः प्रियाय यां भीष्मश्चक्रे सा कामबाधिनी ॥ V. 36.
4. आहूतो न निवर्तेय द्यूतायेति युधिष्ठिरः
   कृत्वा सन्धां शकुनिना दिदेवेत्यर्थबाधिनी ॥ V. 42.
5. भ्रातुर्भ्रातृव्यमुन्मथ्य पास्याम्यस्यासृगाहवे
   प्रतिज्ञाय यथा भीमस्तच्चकारावशो रुषा ॥ V. 39.
6. See काव्यालङ्कार, II. 41, V. 41.
7. ···गृहागतं कृष्णमवादीद्विदुरो यथा ॥
   अद्य या मम गोविन्द जाता त्वयि गृहागते
   कालेनैषा भवेत् प्रीतिस्तवैवागमनात् पुनः ॥ III. 5.
8. भरतस्त्वं दिलीपस्त्वं त्वमेवैलः पुरूरवाः
   त्वमेव वीर प्रद्युम्नस्त्वमेव नरवाहनः ॥ V. 59.

Besides these references to the रामायण and the महाभारत, there are obvious allusions to the stories of उदयन, the king of the Vatsas, and of his son, नरवाहनदत्त, as described in the बृहत्कथा of गुणाढ्य.[1] चाणक्य, the celebrated prime minister to चन्द्रगुप्तमौर्य, has been mentioned as going at night to the pleasure-house of king नन्द.[2]

Bearing in mind all these facts, we really wonder how a person professing a particular religion, should, when writing an important work, have totally forgotten his own religion and betaken himself always to another for illustrations. There is no dearth of legendary stories among the Buddhists. Had he so wished, he could have easily drawn upon them. This fact becomes quite clear on looking into the works of नमिसाधु and others, where it is found that all illustrations are taken from their own religious legends. Not only this. At times, in refuting अपोहवाद for instance, he becomes a bit aggressive to the pet ideas of the Buddhists. If we remember what the influence of the Buddhists was before the advent of श्रीशङ्कराचार्य, what homage they commanded even from royal personages, a Buddhist's partiality towards the Brahmanical religion becomes still more inexplicable. We may admit that these points by themselves do not form any firm ground for the belief that our author was a Hindu, but we have also to admit that the arguments advanced for making him a Buddhist are even more flimsy and consequently less tenable. It is still an open question and will continue to be, until some evidence of definite and undisputed character is forthcoming. In the mean-time we may assure ourselves on the strength of the data within our knowledge that there is more probability in भामह's being considered a Hindu than a Buddhist.

---

1. काव्यालङ्कार, IV. 39 etc.
2. Ibid III. 13.

THE DATE OF **भामह**

The most important problem in connection with **भामह** is his date. It has been the cause of a heated controversy among a number of eminent orientalists for a number of years. After such a long and impassionate discussion, one should expect to have a better result, namely, the exact determination of his date. But unfortunately the result has been quite the reverse. Nothing seems to have been achieved which is not even now enshrouded, to some extent, in the mist of doubt. We propose here to state, as clearly as possible, the various arguments which have been put forward from time to time, to settle this vexed question.

भामह, like most of the Sanskrit writers, does not give any clue to his date in his own work. There is no way of extracting evidence—internal or external—from any known source which may determine his date in exact numbers. What we can do is simply to try to find out the two limits to his date as correctly as the data at our disposal can allow.

Even there we do not seem to be on a very firm ground. We can some how or other settle the lower limit of his date from quotations and references of later writers. But when we proceed to determine the upper limit difficulties begin to multiply. It is there that the great scholars have been crossing swords with each other. Let us, however, begin with the consideration of the lower limit to his date.

By referring to the appendix of our text[1] or to the foot-notes in Mr. Trivedi's text[2], it will be found that the earliest writer to quote **भामह** directly is **आनन्दवर्द्धनाचार्य**. Then we learn from a number of later **आलङ्कारिक**s that **उद्भट** had written a commentary upon the **काव्यालङ्कार** of **भामह**[3]. On

---

1. Published in the Kashi Sanskrit Series, Benares.
2. Appendix VIII, प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण (B. S. S. XLV.)
3. " विशेषोक्तिलक्षणे च <u>भामहविवरणे</u> भट्टोद्भटेन एकदेशशब्द एवं

comparing the contents of उद्भट's independent work काव्यालङ्कारसङ्ग्रह with भामह's काव्यालङ्कार, it will appear that he had not been content with writing a commentary upon the work of भामह, but had freely drawn upon it for his own work[1]. As will be shown later on, he has not only copied भामह's definitions but has verily repeated them verbatim.

वामन's अलङ्कारसूत्रवृत्ति gives clear indications of his acquaintance with the work of भामह. It will be shown later on in detail how much and how far he was indebted to our author in the composition of his own work. It is quite sufficient to remember at present, that at some places[2] he seems to paraphrase the verses of भामह[3] in the form of sutras, at others[4] he appears to repeat those very

---

व्याख्यातो यथेहास्माभिर्निरूपितः"—प्रतिहारेन्दुराज in his commentary upon उद्भट's काव्यालङ्कारसंग्रह (Banhatti's Edn. p. 14).

"भामहोक्तं शब्दश्छन्दोभिधानार्थः" इत्यभिधानस्य शब्दाद्भेदं व्याख्यातुं भट्टोद्भटो बभाषे"—अभिनवगुप्ताचार्य in his ध्वन्यालोकलोचन, p. 10. Also see pp. 39, 207.

" तस्माद्गड्डलिकाप्रवाहेन गुणालङ्कारभेद इति भामहविवरणे यद्भट्टोद्भटोऽभ्यधात् तन्निरस्तम्"—हेमचन्द्र in his अलङ्कार चूडामणि p. 17. See also p. 110.

"अपि च'शब्दानाकुलिता चेति तस्य हेतून् प्रचक्षते'इति भामहीये'वाचामनाकुलत्वेनापि भाविकम्' इति चोद्भटलक्षणे" etc., अलङ्कारसर्वस्व p. 183. (Nirnaya Sagara Edn.)

1. See Dr. De's History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I. p. 45. and Kane's Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, p. XLII.

2. वामन's काव्यालङ्कारसूत्र, IV. 2. 1.

3 भामह's काव्यालङ्कार, II. 30.

4. IV. 2. 20-21.

views which are held by भामह[1]. He has reproduced[2] one śloka which has been cited by भामह in the name of शाखवर्द्धन[3]. At another place[4] he inaccurately quotes a part of भामह's verse[5] and comments upon the use of a word in it. Such a similarity of language, such a correspondence of views, cannot be a matter of accident but must be attributed to the assimilation of the work of an author of established reputation.

It is clear from the above references that भामह flourished before उद्भट and वामन. The date of उद्भट can be fortunately settled with some precision[6]. He is referred to by आनन्दवर्द्धनाचार्य in his ध्वन्यालोक[7] and spoken of as the सभापति of जयापीड by कल्हण. जयापीड़ reigned in Kashmir from 779 to 813 A. C. As this king, on account of his misrule, became unpopular with the Pandits in the latter part of his reign, उद्भट must have lived in his court before 800 A. C. So the period of उद्भट's literary activity may, with some probability, be assigned to the last quarter of the 8th century. His approximate date may therefore be taken as 800 A. C.

---

1. II. 50.
2. IV. 2. 10.
3. II. 46.
4. V. 2. 38
5. II. 27.
6. See N. D. Banhatti's Introduction to his Edn. of उद्भट's अलङ्कारसारसंग्रह, (B. S. S. No. LXXIX, 1925, Poona); See also S. K. De's History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I, p. 75; P. V. Kane's Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, p. XLV; Buhler's Kashmir Report, p. 65.
7. "ध्वन्यलङ्कारान्तरप्रतिभायामपि श्लेषव्यपदेशो भवतीति दर्शितं भट्टोद्भटेन"-ध्वन्यालोक (निर्णयसागर Edn.) p. 96.

"अन्यत्र वाच्यत्वेन प्रसिद्धो यो रूपकादिरलङ्कारः सोऽन्यत्र प्रतीयमान-

The date of **वामन**,[1] too, may be similarly settled. **राजशेखर**, who lived about 900 A.C[2]., refers to the school of **वामन**[3]. This gives us the lower limit of **वामन**. He must have lived before 900 A. C.

वामन quotes verses from the plays of **भवभूति**[4]. Now **भवभूति** lived somewhere between 700 and 750 A. C.[5] **वामन** is, therefore, later than 750. According to **राजतरङ्गिणी**[6], a certain **वामन** was a minister of King **जयापीड़** of Kashmir. There is a tradition among the Pandits of Kashmir that the

---

तया बाहुल्येन प्रदर्शितस्तत्रभवद्भिर्भट्टोद्भटादिभिः"—ध्वन्यालोक p. 108.

1. For details, see Sanskrit Introductions to Bombay and Banglore Editions of वामन's काव्यालङ्कारसूत्रवृत्ति; Dr. Jha's Preliminary note to his translation of वामन's work; Dr. S. K. De's History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I-p. 81ff; P. V. Kane's Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, pp. XLVIII-L

2. Mr. C. D. Dalal's Introduction to काव्यमीमांसा; Dr. Konow's Introduction to कर्पूरमञ्जरी (H. O. S.)

3. "कवयोऽपि भवन्तीति वामनीयाः"—काव्यमीमांसा of राजशेखर (G O. S., No. 1., p. 14.)
   " आग्रहपरिग्राहदपि पदस्थैर्यपर्यवसायस्तस्मात् पदानां परिवृत्तिवैमुख्यं पाकः ' इतिवामनीयाः"—Ibid, p. 20.

4. इयं गेहे लक्ष्मीरियममृतवर्तिर्नयनयोः etc.—उत्तररामचरित cited by वामन under IV. 3. 6.
   पिङ्गालीपक्ष्मलिप्तः etc. मालतीमाधव cited by वामन under V. 2. 18.

5. See R. G. Bhandarkar's preface to his edn. of मालतीमाधव (B. S. S. No. XV) p. XIII—XVII, Bombay, 1905; also Smith's paper in J. R. A. S., 1908., p. 793.

6. " मनोरथः शंखदत्तश्चटकः सन्धिमांस्तथा ।
   बभूवुः कवयस्तस्य वामनाद्याश्च मन्त्रिणः" ॥ IV. 497.

author of काव्यालङ्कार सूत्रवृत्ति was identical with this minister. Bühler[1] believes in this tradition and we see no reason to disbelieve it. So, as shown above, उद्भट and वामन are almost synchronous. It is possible that they were rivals of each other. But it is curious that neither of them refers to the other. Howsoever it may be, the date of उद्भट and वामन is approximately about 800 A. C.

शान्तरक्षित qnotes three ślokas[2] from भामह's काव्यालङ्कार[3] which are definetely ascribed to him by the commentator कमलशील. Now शान्तरक्षित lived from 705 to 762 A.C[5]. Thus 700 A. C. may be safely taken to be the lower limit of भामह, though, as we shall show later on, his real lower limit is furnished by बाण.

Now we come to determine the upper limit to the date of भामह. It is here that we have to encounter difficulties of the highest magnitude. Many suggestions have been made, many theories have been propounded. Let us take them one by one and try to see how much water they can hold.

भामह has at one place referred to a न्यासकार. Some scholars were led to think that this point would be of great help in settling a terminus of भामह. A keen and heated controversy ensued and has been raging for a long time. The credit of raising this learned question and then fighting single-handed to maintain his hypothesis with deep scholarship and reasonable plausibility, belongs to the great orientalist, Prof. K. B. Pathak. He found in भामह's mention of

---

1. See Bühler's Kashmir Report, p. 65.
2. तत्त्वसङ्ग्रह, slokas 912—914 (G.O.S. No. XXX)
3. VI. 17—19.
4. तत्त्वसङ्ग्रह p. 291.
5. See Mr. B. Bhattacharya's Foreword (pp. XIII—XVI) to the तत्त्वसङ्ग्रह

न्यासकार a clear reference to जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि, the Buddhist author of काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका, whom he placed, on the evidence of the Chinese traveller, Itsing, in the 7th century. On the basis of this supposition, he tried to prove that भामह must be assigned to the 8th century.[1] He found a very strong opponent in Mr. K. P. Trivedi who proved to the hilt that the structure of Prof. Pathak's hypothesis was raised upon the foundation of sands.[2] Mr. Trivedi, on the merit of his stronger arguments, was supported by almost all the writers on the subject,[3] and was perhaps able at last to convince of his reasonableness even the originator of this controversy.[4]

The verses where न्यासकार is alluded to in the काव्यालङ्कार of भामह, run thus :—

शिष्टप्रयोगमात्रेण न्यासकारमतेन वा ।
तृचा समस्तषष्ठीकं न कथञ्चिदुदाहरेत ॥
सूत्रज्ञापकमात्रेण वृत्रहन्ता यथोदितः ।
अकेन च न कुर्वीत वृत्तिं तद्गमको यथा ॥

The simple meaning of this extract may be thus expressed—A poet should not make use of a compound, one member of which is formed by adding the suffix तृच् and the

---

1. J. R. A. S. Bom., Vol. xxlii ; Ind. Ant., Vol. xli, 1912.
2. Introd. to प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण, pp. xxxv ff; Ind. Ant., xlii, 1913.
3. Mr. Kane—Introd. to साहित्यदर्पण, pp. xxxv—xxxvi ;
   Dr. S. K. De–History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I, p. 47;
   Dr. Jacobi—Sb. der Preuss. Akad. xxiv (1912) pp. 210—211 ;
   Sovani—Pre-Dhvani Schools, Bh. Com. Vol., p. 393.
4. As far as we know, Prof. Pathak has written nothing after 1913 on this subject.

other by the terminations of the genitive case, supporting it by reference to the usage of a learned man or following the view of न्यासकार. One should not make such a use as was done, when the word वृत्रहन्ता was cited by saying that the sutra of Pāṇini becomes ज्ञापक in such a case. Neither should he bring about a compound of words ending with अक with words ending in the genitive case, as, for example, तद्गमक. The sum and substance of भामह's contention is simply this that पाणिनि's sutra तृजकाभ्यां कर्तरि (II. 2. 15) should be strictly followed and no षष्ठीतत्पुरुष compound formed with words ending in the subjective तृच् and अक suffixes. Consequently no compound takes place in cases like अपां स्रष्टा, वज्रस्य भर्ता, ओदनस्य पाचकः etc. Now the passage in जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि's काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका (popularly known as न्यास) which discusses the use of such compounds, runs as follows :—

अथ किमर्थं तृचः सानुबन्धस्योच्चारणम् ? तृनो निवृत्त्यर्थम् । नैतदस्ति तद्योगे न लोकाव्ययेत्यादिना षष्ठीप्रतिषेधात् । एवं तर्हि एतदेव ज्ञापकं भवति तद्योगेऽपि क्वचित् षष्ठी भवतीति । तेन भीष्मः कुरूणां भयशोकहन्तेत्येवमादि सिद्धं भवति ।

This passage is found in connection with the sutra तृजकाभ्यां कर्तरि (II. 2. 15). Here the न्यासकार is discussing the utility of the अनुबन्ध 'च' in तृच्. पाणिनि could have easily said त्रकाभ्याम् rather than तृजकाभ्याम् । Why has he inserted च ? The answer to this question as given by जिनेन्द्र is that it serves to exclude तृन्. But there comes in another difficulty. तृन् cannot be used with words ending in षष्ठी by न लोकाव्ययनिष्ठाखलर्थतृनाम् (II. 3. 69). षष्ठीसमास is out of question. This objection is met by saying that this very sutra becomes ज्ञापक so that the genitive can be used with the words ending in तृच्. The prohibition by लोकाव्ययनिष्ठा

etc. is inconstant. So whenever we meet with a compound of a word ending with a genitive termination and another ending in तृ, we should say that the suffix added is not तृच् but तृन्. Now, on comparison of these two passages with each other it will be evident that भामह insists upon the prohibition of षष्ठीसमास with words ending in तृच् and अक- As seen in another place[1], he had a very high regard for the authority of पाणिनि. In this particular case also, he wants us to follow the rule of पाणिनि quite literally. He catches this opportunity of referring to the view of a न्यासकार who had allowed (as would appear from the words of भामह) the use of such compounds by saying that this sutra of पाणिनि could very well be taken as a ज्ञापक. It would also appear that the न्यासकार had actually cited the example वृत्रहन्ता and तद्गमक. To ordinary eyes the words of भामह are as clear as anything and they need no torture from out side, unless, of course, they are meant to yield the desired import already conceived.

Prof. Pathak takes great pains to explain this extract in his own favourite way at one place[2], and elsewhere[3] he gives the sum and substance of his contention. We shall just quote a few sentences from the latter place to show the position assumed by the Professor upon this question. " It will be sufficient " he says, " for my present purpose to point out that in the verses cited above Bhāmaha condemns all genitive compounds like वृत्रहन्ता and तद्गमक as ungrammatical, and says that such compounds should never be employed by young authors aspiring to eminence. When he contrasts the शिष्टप्रयोगमात्र with the न्यासकारमत, he does

1. श्रद्धेयं जगति मतं हि पाणिनीयम्--काव्यालङ्कार VI.63.

2. J. R. A. S. Bomb., Vol. XXIII., p. 138.

3. Ind. Ant. XLI, 1912, p. 234.

not mean to say that this particular compound वृत्रहन्ता is used by the शिष्ट or justified by the Nyāsakāra. Bhāmaha mentions this word वृत्रहन्ता as an illustration of the class of genitive compounds justified by the Nyāsakāra. This is amply proved by the expression इत्येवमादि in the sentence भीष्म : कुरूणां भयशोकहन्तेत्येवमादि and by the ज्ञापक discriminating between तृच् and तृन् which applies to all genitive compounds like वृत्रहन्ता । "

Thus Prof. Pathak would have us believe that, in spite of the difference existing between the two, भामह and जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि mean the same thing. As shown above भामह and न्यासकार had supported the use of तृच् compound by the help of पाणिनि's ज्ञापकसूत्र । He had perhaps nothing to say about तृन् at that place. But जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि speaks of तृन्, so that wherever we meet with such compounds, he would call the termination तृन् and not तृच् ।

Let us put the whole thing more clearly. पाणिनि has laid down that compounds of words ending in the genitive terminations with words ending in the subjective तृच् and अक affixes, should never be formed. But difficulty arose when the use of such compounds was met with in the writings of classical writers. Now the grammarians were bound to support such uses some how or other. It became especially more binding on them to support such uses for the reason that even in the sutras of पाणिनि such as जनिकर्तुः प्रकृतिः, such compounds are to be found. The important views on the point can be thus stated :—

(i) Some say that, as पाणिनि himself has made use of such compounds in the sutras जनिकर्तुः प्रकृतिः, तत्प्रयोजको हेतुश्च, the निषेध implied by the sutra तृजकाभ्यां कर्तरि, is not absolutely binding: in certain cases such compounds may be allowed.

(ii) **जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि,** the famous author of the **काशिकान्यास,** would like to say that the termination here is **तृन्** and not **तृच्** and that the prohibition of **षष्ठी** in the case of **तृन्** by the rule **न लोकाव्यय** etc. is **अनित्य.**

(iii) **कैयट** and others hold that in such cases we should explain the 6th case-ending as an instance of **शेषे षष्ठी. भट्टोजिदीक्षित,** who raised this question in his **सिद्धान्तकौमुदी**[1] and summed up all the views in his **प्रौढमनोरमा,**[2] seems to favour the view of **कैयट ;**

(iv) There may be some who having too much regard for grammatical purity, would not permit such uses in any way.

It goes without saying that **भामह** would be very greatly inclined—as he surely is in his **काव्यालङ्कार**— to hold the last view. It is known to all who have any knowledge of Sanskrit Poetics that grammatical purity is not identical with rhetorical purity. An expression may be grammatically justified, but it need not, on that account, be consistent with the canons or dicta of good poetry. In poetry expression is as important as the matter it represents. If an expression is doubtful in point of its structural purity, it will not commend itself to a good poet even though the doubt may be the slightest one. This was indeed the position of **भामह.** From the way in which he refers to the view of a certain **न्यासकार,**

---

1. कथं तर्हि "घटानां निर्मातुस्त्रिभुवनविधातुश्च कलहः" इति । शेषष्ठ्या समास इति कैयटः ।

2. शेष षष्ठया इति । केचित्तु जनिकर्तुः प्रकृतिस्तत्प्रयोजकोहेतुश्चेति-निर्देशादनित्योऽयं निषेध इत्याहुः । न्यासकारस्त्वाह । तृन्नन्तमेतत् । न लोकेति षष्ठीनिषेधस्त्वनित्यः । त्रकाभ्यामिति वक्तव्ये तृचः सानुबन्धकस्य ग्रहणाज् ज्ञापकादिति ।

it would appear that even in his days such grammatical speculations were quite brisk, and the point in question has also attracted the attention of scholars. Perhaps the most important view on this point was that which finds its criticism in the काव्यालङ्कार of भामह, viz., that पाणिनि's sutras were taken as ज्ञापक and the निषेध prescribed by the rule तृजकाभ्यां etc. was considered अनित्य.

Let us now compare the view criticised by भामह with the four views stated above and try to find if it corresponds with any of them. It will be seen at once that it coincides with the first one. It will also appear that the first view is distinctly different from the second one which is held by जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि.

Let us now turn towards the examples. The example found in भामह's काव्यालङ्कार is वृत्रहन्ता but in जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि's न्यास it is भीष्मः कुरूणां भयशोकहन्ता. They do not correspond. Prof. Pathak tells us that " Bhāmaha has mentioned this word वृत्रहन्ता as an illustration of the class of genitive compounds justified by the Nyāsakāra." It is indeed inconceivable why भामह should bring in another set of examples and not use the same which were used by जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि, especially when he was so opposed to his view as to refer to him so very pointedly. It is a common practice among good writers that when they have to discuss or even simply refer to such things, they always cite those very examples which were given by their predecessors. शरणदेव [1], for instance, when giving the substance of the passage quoted above, refers to the

1. कथ भीष्मः कुरूणां भयशोकहन्तेत्युच्यते । तृन्नन्तमेतत् । न च लोकाव्ययनिष्ठेति (II. 3. 69) षष्ठीनिषेधः । यतस्त्रिजकाभ्यमित्यत्र तृचः सानुबन्धकस्योपादानं तृनो निवृत्यर्थं ज्ञापयति तृनो योगे क्वचित् षष्ठीति न्यासः ।

example of जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि. भट्टोजिदीक्षित [1] undoubtedly begins this discussion with a quite different sentence but his position was not the same as that of जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि or of शरणदेव. He is neither criticising nor summarising the statement of the न्यासकार. He selects the sentence from a very popular श्लोक[2] which, the tradition says, was composed by भवभूति while holding a verbal fight with an opponent. This context perhaps becomes a commentary upon the happy selection of an example on the part of the learned author of the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी।

A scholar has to be particularly careful about his language when he is engaged in a discussion with another scholar. The same is the case with जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि who draws his example from the popular work, the महाभारत. But the position of भामह was totally different. In criticising the न्यासकार he must necessarily quote the same example, and this is what he actually did. The word उदितः, in the sentence सूत्रज्ञापकमात्रेण वृत्रहन्ता यथोदितः, clearly proves it. He would have never used the word उदितः if he had selected the example at random.

When Prof. Pathak speaks of जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि as the only न्यासकार, 'he tells us something less than the truth.' In spite of his attempt to prove otherwise, there did exist several न्यास's besides the one attributed to जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि. माधवाचार्य, as ponited out correctly by Mr. Trivedi,[3] mentions in his धातुवृत्ति the names of क्षेमेन्द्रन्यास, न्यासोद्योत, बोधिन्यास, शाकटायनन्यास etc. The attempt made by Prof.

1. कथं तर्हि घटानां निर्मातुस्त्रिभुवनविधातुश्च कलह इति etc.

2. See भोज प्रबन्ध (निर्णयसागर)

3. Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII, 1913, p. 261.

4. "स्पष्टं दैव गूपधूप इत्यत्र न्यासपदमक्षर्यादिषु । अत्र क्षेमेन्द्र न्यासे

Pathak to explain them away by saying that 'the word न्यास is frequently used in the sense of grammatical treatise or commentary'[1] does not seem to improve his position in any way. बाण in his हर्षचरित, as first pointed out by Mr. Kane[2], refers to a न्यास. The expression used there is कृतगुरुपदन्यासाः which is explained by the commentator शङ्कर as कृतोऽभ्यस्तो गुरुपदे दुर्बोधशब्दे न्यासो वृत्तिवि (वि) वरणं यैः[3]. None has so far tried to prove that जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि lived before the reign of हर्षवर्द्धन. Mr. R. Narsimhachar[4] writes about a न्यास written by पूज्यपाद, who, according to Mr. Rice, lived about 500 A. C.

Even if it were possible (but in fact it is not) to show that the न्यासकार referred to by भामह, may be जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि, it is not easy to prove that भामह came after जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि। The only ground on which Prof. Pathak placed him about 700 A.C., is a string of confused statements of the Chinese traveller, Itsing, about the grammarians of those times. All

---

पणतेः सार्वधातुकेऽप्यायविकल्प उक्तः-धातुवृत्ति (Mysore Edn.) Vol. I., p. 266.

"अंकथितं च इत्यत्र न्यासे निवहि हरि जिदण्डीन् प्रस्तुत्य...... ... न्यासेाद्योतेच अजादीनां ग्रामादीनां चेप्सिततमत्वमविशिष्टमित्युक्तम् ibid Vol. I., Pt. II., p. 529.

बेाधिन्यासेऽपि सातिः सुखे वर्तते सौत्र इति । जिनेन्द्रहरदत्तौ सातिर्हेतुमण्ण्यन्तः इति-ibid Vol. 5. Pt. I, p. 122.

शाकटायनन्यासकृतोऽप्ययमेव पक्षोऽभिमतः—ibid Vol. I. Pt. I. p. 94.

It is to be noted here that in all these quotations जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि is distinctly referred to.

1. Ind. Ant., Vol. XLI, 1912, p. 233.
2. J. R. A. S., Bomb 1909, p. 94.
3. हर्षचरित (Führer's Edn.) p. 133.
4. Ind. Ant. XLI, 1912, p. 91.

these statements cannot be accepted as perfectly correct. Dr. Jacobi[1] has therefore rightly called in question the date assigned by Prof. Pathak to जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि. Keilhorn[2], while noticing a fragment from जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि's work in Poona, wrote: "My impression certainly was that Jinendrabuddhi has freely copied from Haradatta's Padamañjari." Dr. Jacobi[3] has shown, on the authority of भविष्योत्तरपुराण, that हरदत्त died in 878 A.C. This will take जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि to the 10th century at least. We have already shown[4] that भामह cannot be later than 700 A.C. It is impossible for जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि to have copied from the पदमञ्जरी of हरदत्त and still be a predecessor of भामह.

We may now sum up this part of our discussion. The न्यासकार referred to by भामह is not जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि as was supposed by Prof. Pathak. He was an old writer whose work has now become extinct and who is wholly unknown to us. His view, as known from भामह, seems to be referred to by भट्टोजिदिक्षित in his प्रौढमनोरमा। So an attempt to find out the other terminus of भामह, with the help of his reference to न्यासकार, cannot go very far and we must look up to something else for it.

भामह and माघ

While dealing with one of the main contributions of Prof. Pathak to the determination of भामह's date, we may, in passing, just note another interesting point raised by the learned professor[5]. This refers to an unconvincing attempt

1. Sitzungsberichte der Preusssischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, XXIV, p. 210
2. J.R.A.S. 1908, p 499
3. Sitz. d. Preuss, Akad. d. Wiss., xxis, p. 211
4. p. 16. above
5. J. R.A.S., Bomb. Vol. XXIII, p. 31.

made by him to find out some chronological relation between भामह and माघ. भामह, at one place,[1] expresses his view about the constitution of काव्य and says शब्दार्थौ सहितौ काव्यम्—a view which has attracted the attention of almost all later आलङ्कारिक's of note. माघ has in शिशुपालवध II. 86. the following beautiful श्लोक—

नालम्बते दैष्टिकतां न निषीदति पौरुषे ।
शब्दार्थौ सत्कविरिव द्वयं विद्वानपेक्षते ॥

Now it is argued that माघ must have been acquainted with भामह's काव्यालङ्कार before he expressed himself in such a strain. This point is maintioned here, not for its importance but for its interest. We need not, therefore, go into detail over this question. Those who feel interested may read the refutation of this argument in the paper of Mr. Kane[2]. We shall only quote a few lines from Dr. J. Nobel's book[3] and leave the rest to the imagination of curious readers. "Māgha is said," writes Dr. J. Nobel, "to refer to the definition of Kāvya as given by Bhāmaha, but if this is considered as an argument I may be allowed to take as an argument of the same force that Kalidāsa in Raghuvanśa I.1., by the words *Vāgarthāviva sampṛktau* refers to the very same definition of Bhāmaha, and that by this fact Bhāmaha's priority may be taken for granted. By using the simile of Śabdārtha, however, Māgha probably refers to that of Kālidāsa or perhaps to some other view and not the definition of Kāvya in Bhāmaha. This argument however, is of no great value, because the so-called definition of Kāvya (as consisting of word and sense united) may go back to some older Ālaṃkārikas."

---

1. काव्यालङ्कार, I. 16.
2. J. R.A.S. Bomb. Vol. XXIII, p. 91. ff.
3. The foundations of Indian Poetry, p. 15—16.

भामह and कालिदास

Still more interesting and equally important is the view which seeks to establish the priority of कालिदास to our author. In भामह's काव्यालङ्कार I. 42-44 we read—

अयुक्तिमद् यथा दूता जलभृन्मारुतेन्दवः ।
तथा भ्रमरहारीतचक्रवाकशुकादयः ॥
अवाचो व्यक्तवाचश्च दूरदेशविचारिणः ।
कथं दूत्यं प्रपद्येरन्निति युक्त्या न युज्यते ॥
यदि चोत्कण्ठया यत्तदुन्मत्त इव भाषते ।
तथा भवतु भूम्नेदं सुमेधोभिः प्रयुज्यते ॥

भामह is criticising here those poets who make in their works the cloud, the wind, the moon and similarly some birds to appear as messengers. He calls this an instance of अयुक्तिमद्दोष. It goes wholly against reason, he says, that such creatures should be able to perform the duties of messengers. But he concedes this in the case of those intelligent posts, who, when making use of such devices, show them to be employed by men who are out of their wits.

Now some scholars[1] argue that भामह must have had in mind the मेघदूत of कालिदास where a cloud has been used as a messenger. It is also pointed out that a passage[1] of भामह seems to borrow an idea and phraseology from two

---

1. Haricand.—L'Art Poetique de L'Inde, p. 77 ;
V. V. Sovani—Pre-dhawani Schools, Bhandarkar commomoration Volume, p. 393 ;
S. K. De.—History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I. 48.

2 अस्मिन् जहीहि सुहृदि प्रणयाभ्यसूयामाश्लिष्यगाढममुमानतमादरेण ।
विन्ध्यं महानिव घनः समयेऽभिवर्षन्नानन्दजैर्नयनवारिभिरुक्षतु त्वाम् ॥
I. 56.

श्लोकs[1] of कालिदास. This shows that कालिदास must have flourished before भामह.

Others, on the other hand, hold quite an opposite view. " Bhāmahāchārya, " writes Dr. T. Ganpati Sāstri[2], "it seems to me, must have lived long prior to Kālidāsa. For while he mentions such names of poets and poems as Medhāvī, Rāma Śarmā, Aśmakavaṃśa, Ratnaharaṇa, Achyutottara, all unknown to us, he has never mentioned the name of Kālidāsa of world-wide fame or any of his works of supreme excellence. But had Bhāmaha ever seen the poems of Kālidāsa he would have of course mentioned them or made them also as in the case of Pratijñānātikā subject of his criticism." After this the learned Paudit quotes those three verses of भामह[3] which we have given above and remarks—"From this we cannot conclude that भामह was conversant with the poem Meghadūta, for then we could as well infer that he knew also of Śukasandeśa written by a poet of yesterday. Hence, I think, that by these ślôkas, our Āchārya only teaches us generally that the fashion in some of our Kāvyas of lovers sending messages through such inanimate objects as the wind, the moon, the clouds and such living inarticulate creatures as the bee, the chakravaka and the parrot is not desirable on occasions when the sender of the message is in a state of sobriety. Bearing in mind this instruction of our

---

1 अथाभिषेकं रघुवंशकेतोः प्रारब्धमानन्दजलैर्जनन्योः ।
निर्वर्तयामासुरमात्यवृद्धास्तीर्थाहृतैः काञ्चनकुम्भतोयैः ॥
सरित्समुद्रान् सरसीश्च गत्वा रक्षःकपीन्द्रैरुपपादितानि ।
तस्यापतन् मूर्ध्नि जलानि जिष्णोर्विन्ध्यस्य मेघप्रभवा इवापः ॥
—रघुवंश XIV. 7-8

2. Introduction to स्वप्नवासवदत्ता and प्रतिज्ञायौगन्धरायण (Trivendrum Edn.)

3. काव्यालङ्कार, I. 42-44.

Āchārya, Kālidāsa, with his keen sense of poetic propriety, observes, in defence of his message through the cloud at the begining of Meghadūta :—

धूमज्योतिःसलिलमरुतां सन्निपातः क्व मेघः
सन्देशार्थाः क्व पटुकरणैः प्राणिभिः प्रापनीयाः।
इत्यौत्सुक्यादपरिगणयन् गुह्यकस्तं ययाचे
कामार्ता हि प्रकृतिकृपणाश्चेतनाचेतनेषु॥—पूर्वमेघ।

Thus it is seen that Bhāmaha lived much prior to Kalidāsa."

This long quotation from the most important exponent of this side of the view, will make the position quite clear. It may be interesting to know that Dr. Nobel also was formerly a believer in the priority of भामह to कालिदास. Even now, with his belief slightly shaken, (simply because he could not directly prove it) he is more inclined to accept the priority of भामह to कालिदास than that of कालिदास to भामह.[1]

Taking the arguments from both sides into consideration, we may confess that much can be said on both sides and that nothing is really settled. One cannot imagine that such a criticism can be possible without any work to be criticised and explain on the other hand, why other things connected with कालिदास should not have come under the notice of भामह, if the works of the great poet were known to him.

Whatsoever may be the fact, it is needless to carry this discussion to any further length, because, even if it were decided one way or the other, it will not in any way help us in determining the date of भामह. The date of कालिदास itself is a bone of contention and cannot be made a basis for determination of other dates.

---

1. See Nobel's The Foundations of Indian Poetry, pp. 14-15.

भामह AND **भास.**

The same remark is to be made with regard to the chronological relation of **भामह** and **भास**, though in this case, it has not been suggested by any person that **भामह** came after the author of the work he is criticising. The difficulty with us here is that we cannot exactly know what work he is criticising. The verses in the **काव्यालङ्कार** of **भामह** which refer to the criticism in question read thus—

विजिगीषुमुपन्यस्य वत्सेशं वृद्धदर्शनम् ।
तस्यैव कृतिनः पश्चादभ्यधाच्चरशून्यताम् ॥
अन्तर्योधशताकीर्णं सालङ्कायननेतृकम् ।
तथाविधं गजच्छद्म नाज्ञासीत् स स्वभूगतम् ॥
यदि वोपेक्षितं तस्य सचिवैः स्वार्थसिद्धये ।
अहो नु मन्दिमा तेषां भक्तिर्वा नास्ति भर्तरि ॥
शरा दृढधनुर्मुक्ता मन्युमद्भिररातिभिः ।
मर्माणि परिहृत्यास्य पतिष्यन्तीति कानुमा ॥
हतोऽनेन मम भ्राता मम पुत्रः पिता मम ।
मातुलो भागिनेयश्च रुषा संरब्धचेतसः ॥
अस्यन्तो विविधान्याजावायुधान्यपराधिनम् ।
एकाकिनमरण्यानां न हन्युर्बहवः कथम् ॥
नमोऽस्तु तेभ्यो विद्वद्भ्यो येऽभिप्रायं कवेरिमम् ।
शास्त्रलोकावपास्यैव नयन्ति नयवेदिनः ॥
सचेतसो वनेभस्य चर्मणा निर्मितस्यच ।
विशेषं वेद बालोऽपि कष्टं किन्तु कथं नु तत् ॥ IV.39-46

The stories of **उदयन**, the king of **वत्स**s, were very popular in ancient India, so much so that many works, even besides those which directly devote themselves to them, refer to them here and there. So when we find such a criticism in the work of **भामह**, we cannot exactly determine what is the actual object of his criticism. Dr. T. Ganapati Śāstri suggests that the work criticised must be **प्रतिज्ञायौगन्धरायण**. "The subject reviewed by Bhāmaha above," says the eminent

editor, " is seen in its entirety in Pratijñānāṭikā. Moreover, the Prakrit passage " अरोण मम भादा हदो, अरोण मम पिदा, अरोण मम सुदो" in the first Act of Pratijñānāṭikā is quoted in the form of verse, " हतोऽनेनमम भ्राता मम पुत्रः पिता मम " by Bhāmaha, in his enquiry on Nyāyavirodha."

In spite of this suggestion made by the learned Pandit, we may observe that the case is much doubtful. भामह does not mention the name of भास or his प्रतिज्ञायौगन्धरायण. He may be criticising गुणाढ्य's वृहत्कथा itself which was indeed the oldest compendium of such stories. The Prakrit portion common with भामह's श्लोक, might have a similar representative passage there also. Moreover, the theory of the learned Śāstri itself, as observes Mr. Kane, is based on a very weak foundation. If we examine the passage from भामह more closely, it will be found that the story criticised by him is not exactly the same as found in प्रतिज्ञायौगन्धरायण. It corresponds more with the versions found in वृहत्कथा मञ्जरी and कथा-सरित्-सागर. They are known to be the epitomes of वृहत्कथा. But even if it was proved that it is भास who has been criticised, it will not help us in any way. For the last 14 years, a sharp controversy has been going on, not only with regard to the date of भास, but also concerning the authenticity of the works published in his name. As there is no certainty about the date of भास, there is no use putting it forward as a terminus of भामह.

भामह AND भट्टि ।

It will not be perhaps out of place to devote some space here for discussing the relation of भट्टि and भामह. It is a well-known tradition among the Pandits of India that भट्टि, the famous author of the grammatical Kāvya, known as रावणवध or simply as भट्टिकाव्य, tried to furnish illustrations

to the **काव्यालङ्कार** in the four cantos (X—XIII) known as **प्रसन्नकाण्ड** exactly as he did in others for the sutras of Pāṇini. This tradition finds further support from the statements of the commentators[1]. It would appear from the way they write that **भट्टि** wrote the 10th canto to illustrate figures of word and sense, 11th, **माधुर्यगुण**, 12th, **भाविक** and the 13th Sanskrit and Prakrit Kāvya. **प्रसादगुण** finds its illustration in all the four cantos. If we look at the **श्लोक**s illustrating **अलङ्कार**s in canto X, we shall find, from the order and the way they are given, that **भट्टि** had **भामह**'s **काव्यालङ्कार** before him. The commentators **जयमङ्गल** and **मल्लिनाथ** have freely drawn upon the work of **भामह** for giving the definitions of these **अलङ्कार**s in their commentaries.[2] They could have easily taken the definitions from later and fuller rhetorcial works. But then the illustrative **श्लोक**s would not have so well conformed to those definitions. There is a **श्लोक** in **भामह**'s **काव्यालङ्कार** which is found in **भट्टिकाव्य** with very slight alterations. The **श्लोक** of **भामह** is—

काव्यान्यपि यदीमानि व्याख्यागम्यानि शास्त्रवत् ।
उत्सवः सुधियामेव हन्त दुर्मेधसो हताः ॥ —II. 20

In **भट्टिकाव्य** we have

---

1. शब्दलक्षणमुक्तमपि लक्षयन् काव्यलक्षणार्थं प्रसन्नकाण्डमुच्यते, काव्यस्यात्र प्रसन्नत्वात् । प्रथमं चेदं लक्षणं यत्प्रसन्नता नाम आविद्वदङ्गनाबालप्रतीतार्थं प्रसन्नवदिति ।.... ....तथास्मिन् काण्डे चत्वारः परिच्छेदाः । अलङ्कार माधुर्यप्रदर्शनदोषाः भाषासमावेशश्चेति etc.—जयमङ्गल in his commentary in the beginning of canto X.

शब्दलक्षणप्रधानेऽप्यास्मिन् काव्ये काव्यलक्षणत्वादधिकारकण्डानन्तरमलङ्कार माधुर्य भाविक भाषासमाख्य परिच्छेदचतुष्टयात्मकमारभमानोऽस्मिन् सर्गे तावदलङ्कारपरिच्छेदं वदन्नादौ शद्बालङ्कारान् लेशतो दर्शयति । —मल्लिनाथ in his commentary on भट्टिकाव्य in the beginning of canto X.

2. See परिशिष्ट to our edn. of भामह's काव्यालङ्कार. जयमङ्गल has no less than 33 quotations from this work.

व्याख्यागम्यमिदं काव्यमुत्सवः सुधियामलम् ।
हता दुर्मेधसश्चास्मिन् विद्वत्प्रियतया मया ॥—XXII.34.

Here it can be imagined quite easily that one of the two must have borrowed from the other. श्रीवत्साङ्कमिश्र ascribes the former श्लोक to भामह. There on this authority it necessarily follows that भट्टि must have imitated भामह in writing his श्लोक.[1] All these facts, stated above, cannot but point to one conclusion, in that भामह was prior to भट्टि.

Now as regards the date of भट्टि, the only clue which we have is his श्लोक forming the last verse of his काव्य. It is—

काव्यमिदं विहितं मया वलभ्यां
श्रीधरसेननरेन्द्रपालितायाम् ।
कीर्तिरतो भवतान्नृपस्य तस्य
प्रेमकरः क्षितिपो यतः प्रजानाम् ॥—XXII. 35.

The history of Kathiawar tells us that there were four Kings with the name of धरसेन who ruled over वलभी (modern Vala). It is not quite clear which धरसेन is alluded to by भट्टि[2].

Prof. B. C. Mazumdar[3] identifies the author of भट्टिकाव्य with वत्सभट्टि, mentioned in the Mandasor Sun Temple Inscription,[4] dated 473 A.C. on the ground of similarty between the verses of the inscription and the description of autumn in the भट्टिकाव्य.[5] But this identification is considered by Prof. Keith as a 'most unfortunate suggestion'[6].

1. Trivedi—Ind. Ant., Vol. XLII, p. 264.
2. For more information, see Mr. Trivedi's introduction to भट्टिकाव्य (B. S. S. No LVI.)
3. J. R. A, S., 1904, pp. 395-397.
4. Fleet's Gupta Inscriptions, No. 18.
5. Canto II.
6. J. R. A. S., 1909, p. 759.

But the two learned professors are at one in saying that भट्टि flourished before भारवि and दण्डी. We may go so for as to say, with Mr. Trivedi[1] that " our poet lived in the latter part of the sixth and the beginning of the seventh century." But the safest course will be to side with Mr. Kane[2] and say that " भट्टि must have lived sometime between 500 and 650 A.C. "[3] Whatever might have been the difference with regard to the date of भट्टि, none was heard to suggest till 1922 that भट्टि was prior to भामह. In this year Dr. Jacobi[4] struck a new line of argument in determining the date of भामह. He tried to prove with all plausibility that भामह had drawn his material for the 5th chapter of काव्यालङ्कार from the न्यायबिन्दु of धर्मकीर्ति. This necessitated the placing of भामह after 650 A. C. Now भट्टि, as shown above, cannot be later than 650. So the learned scholars were compelled to look upon the relation of भट्टि to भामह from quite a different angle of vision. Dr. S. K. De, who, as far as we remember, never disagrees with Dr. Jacobi but always follows in his foot-steps, writes[5]—" At one time it was believed, on the indication given by Jayamangala on Bhatti that the alamkāra-chapters in that काव्य especially

---

1. Introduction to his Edn. of भट्टिकाव्य (B. S. S. No. LVI), P. XXII.

2. Introduction to his Edn. of साहित्यदर्पण, P. XVI.

3. For the discussions on the date of भट्टि, see also Dr. Jacobi-Z. D. M. G., XLIV and also Sitz. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. 1922, pp. 216-17 ; V. V. Sovani—Bhandarkar commomoration Volume, p. 393; S. K. De—History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I. p. 50ff.

4. Sitz. d. Preuss Akad. d. Wiss., No. XXIV, pp-211-12.

5. History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I p. 50.

canto X, was meant to illustrate the rhetorical teachings of Bhāmaha in particular, but the date now assigned to Bhāmaha (i. e. after धर्मकीर्ति's date 650) will re-adjust his relation to Bhatti in a new light." The two learned doctors have taken great pains in 're-adjusting' भामह's relation to भट्टि. Re-adjustnent has been in the present case nothing less than perfect reversion of the former position. There is no use of examining on our part this 're-adjustment' in all its details, for it has not been so much a child of logic as one of necessity. The present case appears to us like that of a certain talented lawyer. He once began to put forward arguments which might have been advanced by the other side. When he was on the point of completing his arguments, he was made aware of his blunder by one of his colleagues. He remained unmoved and at once addressed the court. "My Lords, such will be the arguments put forward by the other side. Now I begin to refute them." We wonder why the premises of the conclusion which upset the whole thing, were not more carefully examined to see if there was some other alternative possible. Such cases of resemblance, corroboroted by the record of commentators and confirmed by the voice of tradition, as exist between the काव्यालङ्कार of भामह and the रावणवध of भट्टि, cannot be a matter of mere chance. As we shall try to show later on, भामह cannot be carried below 600 A.C. He may be much earlier. So there is no necessity of putting the cart before the horse.

दण्डी and भामह.

Now we come to one of the most important parts of the discussion upon the date of भामह. दण्डी, the auther of काव्यादर्श, has been very popular among the literati of mediæval India, perhaps even to some extent more than भामह himself, who had the misfortune of having his work not

so easily available. On a close study of the works of these great poeticians, the impression becomes irresistible that they were related to each other, some way or other. There are some passages which are identical in the works of both, not only in sense but even in phraseology[1]. There are others, more important still, which appear to involve mutual criticism.[2] Besides, there are various views—either similar or dissimilar to one another—which clearly point to an intimate relation existing between the काव्यालङ्कार and काव्यादर्श[3] ।

These impressions, culled from the works of these two writers, led to the discussion of their chronological relation with each other. A sharp controversy ensued for settling the priority of one to the other. Mr. M. T. Narsimheingar raised this issue for the first time and was inclined to place दण्डी before भामह[4] He found his arguments very ably refuted by such eminent scholars as Mr. Trivedi[5], Dr. Jacobi[6], Prof. Rangacharya[7], Dr. Ganpati Śastri[8] and Prof. Pathak[9]. The last seems, however, to have changed his view later on[10]. As the majority of views appears to favour the priority of भामह, we need not encumber our humble paper with the statements of all views held either

---

1. Kane—Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, p. XXV ; De—History of Sanskrit Poetics, I. pp. 64-65.
2. De—History of Sanskrit Poetics, I. pp. 65-66.
3. Kane—Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, pp. XXV—XXXV.
4. J. R. A. S., 1905, pp. 535 ff.
5. Introduction to प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण pp. XXIII ff. ; Ind. Ant. XLII, ff. ; Bhandarkar Com. Vol., p. 40.
6. Z. D. M. G., LXIV, pp. 134 and 139.
7. Introduction to his edition of काव्यादर्श.
8. Introduction to स्वप्नवासवदत्त, p. XXV.
9. Introduction to कविराजमार्ग, p. 16.
10. J.B.B.R.A.S , XXIII. p. 19; Ind. Ant. XLI., p. 236 ff.

against or in favour of his priority. Mr. Kane has very cautiously collected the arguments of either side and those who feel interested may refer to his learned work[1]. Mr. Kane, after stating and examining all such views with admiriable impartiality, has come to the conclusion that in reality no judgement is yet possible on the question one way or the other though from the character of the arguments employed he seems to be somewhat inclined in favour of दण्डी's priority to भामह. He sums up his position thus : " It seems probable that भामह and दण्डी follow independent traditions, the former having more affinity with the अलङ्कार school and the latter with भरत's school. Whoever may be earlier, both are very near cach other and are to be placed between 500-630 A. C.[2]" Dr. De has, however, by forcibly re-stating some cogent arguments, ably demonstrated that the majority view is the only best logical alternative[3].

We shall, by way of concluding this portion of our paper, state one or two points which, to our mind, would conclusively show that भामह cannot be brought down to a period later than दण्डी. Recently a book named अवन्तिसुन्दरीकथा has been discovered in the South by the Curator of the Madras Oriental MSS. Library[4]. It is evident from the said MS. that it was written by दण्डी. It is prefaced, as is usually done in कथाs, with a number of verses. These verses include the praise of बाण and मयूर[5] along with that

1. Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, pp. XXV—XXXV.
2. Ibid p. XXXV.
3. History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. I, pp. 64—70.
4. Proceedings and Transactions of the Second Oriental Conference, pp. 193–201; Journal of the Mythic Society, XIII, pp. 671–685.
5. भिन्नस्तीक्ष्णमुखेनापि चित्रं बाणेन निर्व्यथः ।
व्याहारेषु जहौ लीलां न मयूरः............ ॥

of many others. From this Poetic Introduction, we further learn that दण्डी was a great-grandson of भारवि who has been described here as a contemporary of kings दुर्विनीत and सिंहविष्णु. These monarchs were great ruling kings about 580 A.C. Thus it appears quite reasonable to infer that दण्डी, being fourth in descent from भारवि, must have belonged to the last quarter of the 7th or the begining of the 8th Century. This statement finds an additional support from the fact that दण्डी has not only praised बाणभट्ट but has narrated the story of कादम्बरी along with other episodes in his कथा and this narration seems to be an accurate reproduction of the tale as is found in the पूर्वार्द्ध of बाण's कादम्बरी. It is a well known fact that बाण belonged to the court of हर्षवर्धन who reigned from 606 to 648 A.C. A northern poet cannot be expected to have achieved in a decade or two, in those days of hard communication, so much fame as to merit such a high praise from a critic of the South.

It may be further shown on a most reliable authority that भामह must have lived before बाण. आनन्दवर्धन in hsı ध्वन्यालोक,[1] while asserting that the same idea, though already expressed by one poet, appears new and charming when put in a suggestive garb by another poet, points out a case where बाणभट्ट, drawing upon an idea expressed by भामह in one of his verses of काव्यालङ्कार, writes a prose

---

1. तथा विवक्षितान्यपरवाच्यस्यैव शब्दशक्त्युद्भवानुरणनरूपव्यङ्ग्यप्रकार-समाश्रयेण नवत्वम् । यथा 'धरणीधारणायाधुना त्वं शेषः' (हर्षचरित VI. para 15 of Kane's edition) इत्यादौ 'शेषो हिमगिरिस्त्वं च महान्तो गुरवः स्थिराः । यदलङ्घितमर्यादाश्चलन्तीं बिभ्रते भुवम्' (काव्यालङ्कार III 27.) इत्यादौ सत्स्वपि तस्यैवार्थशक्त्युद्भवानुरणनरूपव्यङ्ग्यसमाश्रयेण नवत्वम् ।—ध्वन्यालोक, उद्योत IV p.236.

passage in हर्षचरित. It is quite clear from this that आनन्द-वर्धन had positive belief which must have been based on traditions prevalent among the Kāśmirian Pandits of his day that भामह was an old and popular predecessor of बाण so that the latter could safely and honourably borrow ideas from the former. Hence unless this statement of आनन्दवर्धन is shown to militate against the verdict of accepted chronology bearing on the question (as is quite unlikely) the fact of भामह's priority can never be challenged.

With due deference to those who hold that भामह and दण्डी are chronologically very near to and not far removed from each other, we may be permitted to observe here, in passing, that to us it does not appear to be the fact. भामह most probably belonged to Kāśmir and दण्डी undoubtedly hailed from the South. It cannot be imagined that the writers so far removed could vie with each other in those days. It cannot be denied that दण्डी, with an evident criticising mood, tries to eclipse the work of भामह by his own. This case is somewhat like भारवि and माघ who, though not far removed in space, were, in time, far away from each other. This point can be further borne out by the linguistic evidence. The प्राकृतs had not, perhaps, been so much in vogue in the time of भामह as they were in the time of दण्डी. Perhaps सेतुबन्ध which finds such a high and merited eulogy from दण्डी had not yet been written. भामह makes no linguistic division of काव्य as दण्डी does. If it could be proved that the प्राकृतमनोरमा, the oldest commentary on वररुचि's प्राकृतप्रकाश, was from the pen of this very भामह, the author of काव्यालङ्कार, it might be held to have been the oldest work on Prakrit Grammar, next only to वररुचि, the author of the सूत्रs it comments upon. In this connection it may be pointed out that the later महाराष्ट्री—not to say

the other dialects—does not wholly conform to the rules of वररुचि as explained by भामह and that the later commentators, वसन्तराज and others, have tried to explain the सूत्रs in a much more comprehensive way. Howsoever it may be, it is undoubtedly clear that the picture of society found in the work of भामह—faintly drawn though it may be—can be clearly distinguished from what we find depicted in the काव्यादर्श of दण्डी. The poetic luminaries so familiar to the eyes of भामह's age had, by the time of दण्डी, totally disappeared from the horizon. The elegant simplicity of the earlier Muse had not as yet hardened into sentimental ideas and artistic expressions. The sharp controversies ranging between the Buddhists and the Hindus in the time of भामह, had led to the study of the science and art of Polemics, so that even a work on Poetics was expected to take the topics into consideration. But the atmosphere seems to have wholly changed by the time of दण्डी. The heroes of popular stories were yet fresh in the memory of the people. Coming to the field of Poetics itself, we find not a few points of contrast along with those of similarity in the works of these two authors. There is no use enlarging upon this topic, for, it can become obvious to even a casual reader of the said works. We feel, therefore, inclined to believe that भामह was seperated from दण्डी not by decades but by centuries.

भामह and धर्मकीर्ति.

We have shown above that on the evidence of आनन्दवर्धन in ध्वन्यालोक, भामह cannot be placed later than बाण who flourished in the first half of the 7th century; but this view is seriously challenged by the hypothesis that भामह has borrowed some logical topics from धर्मकीर्ति. Dr. Jacobi has discussed this point at some length and in

that connection has considered the date of धर्मकीर्ति. He places धर्मकीर्ति between the sojourns in India of Houen Tsang and of Itsing. The former who travelled between 630 and 643 makes no reference to the Buddhist Logician. The latter, travelling between 671 to 695, seems clearly to have heard of him. Tārānātha[1] makes धर्मकीर्ति a contemporary of the Tibetan King Sroṅ-tsan-gam-po who lived during 627-698 A. C. So the middle of the seventh century may be fairly taken to be the date of धर्मकीर्ति. If, however, it could be proved, as Jacobi has tried to do, that भामह had actually utilised the logical work of धर्मकीर्ति, the statement of आनन्दवर्धन would considerably lose in value and भामह would consequently have the chance of being dragged down to the 8th century at least. Let us first examine the arguments put forward therefor.

All the arguments put forward for establishing the indebtedness of भामह to धर्मकीर्ति are based upon a few points of similarity existing in their works[2]. They are only three. Let us take them one by one. भामह has given two definitions of अनुमान—

त्रिरूपाल्लिङ्गतो ज्ञानमनुमानं च केचन ।
तद्विदो नान्तरीयार्थदर्शनं चापरे विदुः ॥ काव्या० V. 11

Now we know from the तात्पर्यटीका of वाचस्पतिमिश्र upon न्यायवार्तिक that the definition of अनुमान, as given here in the second half of the śloka, came originally from दिङ्नाग[3]. But what are we to say about the first difinition ? " Die

1. See Vidyābhūṣaṇa's History of Indian Logic, pp. 305-6.

2. See Dr. Jacobi's ' Bhāmaha und Daṇḍin ihr Alterund ihre Stellung in der indischen Poetic' in Sitz. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss., XXIV, 1922, pp. 211-212.

3. See Dr. Randle's 'Fragments from Diṅnāga,' pp. 21-22.

erste der beiden von Bhāmaha gegeben Definitionen", writes Dr. Jacobi, "mutz also von einem andern Philosophen herrühren". And who is that another philosopher? It is धर्मकीर्ति—says Dr. Jacobi, for, at one place of his न्यायबिन्दु, we read अनुमानं द्विधा स्वार्थं परार्थं च, तत्र स्वार्थं त्रिरूपाल्लिङ्गाद् यदनुमेये ज्ञानं तदनुमानम् ।

In this case as well as in the cases following, the question, which we are to put to ourselves, should be whether a particuliar view— लिङ्गस्य त्रैरूप्यम् for instance—is peculiar with someone or is common to many. Such an argument can have any weight only when the view concerned is original. Unfortunately we do not find any such thing in the present case. लिङ्गस्य त्रैरूप्यम् is a too well-known thing with our नैयायिकs to have originated with धर्मकीर्ति. It is quite sufficient for our purpose here to show that it was known even to दिङ्नाग. Thanks to the labours of the late lamented Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇa, we can have some knowledge of दिङ्नाग's works. दिङ्नाग in his प्रमाणसमुच्चय spoke of स्वार्थानुमान thus[1]: An inference for one's self (svārthānumāna, raṅ-don-gyi-ṛjes-ḍpag) is defined as the knowledge of a thing derived through its mark or sign of three characters. Will it not, when turned into Sanskrit, read somewhat exactly like the extract from न्यायबिन्दु of धर्मकीर्ति cited above? In this connection we are to note one thing more. The way in which भामह gives this definition along with that of दिङ्नाग, does not only show that it came from some other source, but also to the fact that it formed an earlier and more commonly accepted view. Besides प्रमाणसमुच्चय, we have a clear description of लिङ्गस्य त्रैरूप्यम् in न्यायप्रवेश.[2] Whoever might be the

---

1. See Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇa's History of Indian Logic, p. 280.

2. This work has been so long known only through Tibetan

author of this work,[1] none has so far tried to prove that it was written after धर्मकीर्ति. Thus we see that भामह was not in any way indebted to धर्मकीर्ति for his knowledge of लिङ्गस्य त्रैरूप्यम्. We are very much inclined to think that he had not to thank even दिङ्नाग for, at least, this section of Indian Logic. He might have probably derived his knowledge from some earlier logician.

The other statement of भामह which has been said to correspond with that of धर्मकीर्ति is दूषणं न्यूनताद्युक्तिः (काव्या०-V. 28). धर्मकीर्ति has दूषणानि न्यूनताद्युक्तिः[2] । The similarity is indeed striking. But the question again comes up: Is it an original idea of धर्मकीर्ति? The same question may be raised with regard to the third corresponding statement of भामह—जातयो दूषणाभासाः (काव्या०-V. 29). Does धर्मकीर्ति propound a new theory when he says दूषणाभासास्तु जातयः[3]? In both the above cases, धर्मकीर्ति does not appear to have anything peculiar to himself. The दूषणs and जातिs have been known to earlier writers

---

Texts. Fortunately it is now going to be published by Principal A. B. Dhruva in the Gaekwad Oriental Series. We owe our knowledge of it to the kindness of Principal Dhruva.

For the three characteristics of the Middle Term (लिङ्गस्य त्रैरूप्यम्) as found in न्यायप्रवेश, see History of Indian Logic, p. 291.

1. The question is a mooted one. We postpone its discussion for the time being.

2. न्यायबिन्दु, (Peterson's Edn.) III. 138.
Benares Edn. reads दूषणा न्यूनताद्युक्तिः. See p. 132.

3. न्यायबिन्दु, Peterson's Edn. III. 140; Benares Edn. p. 133.

as well[1]. In न्यायप्रवेश we have similar descriptions of दूषणs and जातिs[2].

Mr. P. V. Kāṇe[3], who, as has been noted before, pointed out the similarity existing between the works of भामह and धर्मकीर्ति, quite independently of Dr. Jacobi, has cited another śloka from भामह's काव्यालङ्कार, appearing somewhat exactly like a passage in धर्मकीर्ति's न्यायबिन्दु. भामह's śloka reads thus;

सत्त्वादयः प्रमाणाभ्यां प्रत्यक्षमनुमा च ते ।
असाधारणसामान्यविषयत्वं तयोः किल ॥ काव्या०-V. 5

धर्मकीर्ति writes thus:

द्विविधं सम्यग्ज्ञानं प्रत्यक्षमनुमानं च (p. 10). तस्य विषयः स्वलक्षणं (p. 21)......अन्यत् सामान्यलक्षणं (p. 24) सोऽनुमानस्य विषयः (p. 25). Now it may be again pointed out here that this division and definition of प्रमाणs has not originated with धर्मकीर्ति । Almost all the logicians who were opposed to अक्षपाद (who propounded four प्रमाणs) had mostly a similar view. दिङ्नाग, for instance, in his प्रमाणसमुच्चय (ch. 1) states that pramāṇas are only two, *viz.*, perception and inference. All objects being known through them, there is no other प्रमाण । Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇa has restored the Sanskrit original thus:

---

1. They are too well-known to require much argumentation for establishing their existence before धर्मकीर्ति. In this connection it will be, however, interesting to refer to a न्यायसूत्र of गौतम (1-2-18) and वात्स्यायन's भाष्य thereon The sutra is साधर्म्यवैधर्म्याभ्यां प्रत्यवस्थानं जातिः । वात्स्यायन comments upon it thus :—प्रयुक्ते हि हेतौ यः प्रसङ्गो जायते सा जातिः । स च प्रसङ्गः साधर्म्यवैधर्म्याभ्यां प्रत्यवस्थानमुपालम्भः प्रतिषेध इति ।..... ......प्रत्यनीकभावाज्जायमानोऽर्थो जातिरिति ।

2. See Vidyābhūṣaṇa's History of Indian Logic, p. 298.

3. Introduction to his Edn. of साहित्यदर्पण, p. XL.

प्रत्यक्षमनुमानं च प्रमाणं हि द्विलक्षणम् ।
प्रमेयं तत्र सिद्धं हि न प्रमाणान्तरं भवेत् ॥

It will be seen from the above that all those passages from धर्मकीर्ति, which have been cited as originals of भामह's ślokas, have no originality with themselves. They represent views which were quite well-known even before the birth of the Buddhist logician. Under such circumstances one cannot safely argue that भामह was indebted to धर्मकीर्ति and to nobody else. Dr. Jacobi is not such a superficial scholar as to be convinced of भामह's indebtedness to धर्मकीर्ति simply upon the basis of accidental similarity of views. We presume that it was the partial similarity of phraseology too, which led him to entertain such a view. But to our mind, the similariy of phraseology in the present case is not so very significant. Striking similarity is seen only in the sentences which deal with दूषणs and जातिs. But there again, we cannot say that धर्मकीर्ति was the first person to use them. With equal force, we may say that it was भामह who wrote them first of all. We see no absurdity in it. If शान्तरक्षित, philosopher as he was, did not find it inconvenient to repeat the phraseology of our poetician, we see no reason why धर्मकीर्ति would not do the some, if he could find something handy, cut and dried, from him.

What we want to emphasise very particularly is simply this that the similarity of phraseology, even if it could be proved to exist beyond doubt, will not by itself be of much use. In such a case, there are three alternatives possible, each of which being equally tenable. Now with regard to the topic in question, unless and until more definite evidence is forthcoming, none can be justified in claiming that भामह borrowed views and phraseology from धर्मकीर्ति It may be

equally cogent to say that धर्मकीर्ति was indebted to भामह or both of them had utilised some common source.

As far as we are aware, Dr. Jacobi did not point out any other line of evidence which could further support his assumption. "Diese Entlehungen Bhāmahas" says the great orientalist, " aus Dharmakīrtis Nyāyabindu beweisen, dass er jünger als dieser, wenn auch vielleicht nur ein jüngerer Zeitgenosse desselben, war". But how has the indebtedness of भामह been proved? There he writes thus: "Nun lautet Dharmakīrtis Definition, Nyāyabindu II. 3: tatra trirūpālliṅgād yad anumeye jñānaṃ, tad anumānaṃ so ähnlich der Bhāmaha von gegebenen, dass kaum noch ein Zweifel darüber bestehen kann, woher letzterer sie genommen hat. Noch deutlicher zeigen uns das Bhāmaha Definitionen der dūṣaṇas und der jātis in V. 28." This is the sum and substance of all his statements in this connection. We really wonder how such a veteran scholar as Dr. Jacobi, with such faulty and inadequate premises, could jump to such a momentous conclusion. Mr. P. V. Kāṇe, with characteristic cautiousness of a lawyer, did not, though suggesting the same line of argument, commit himself in any way. He is perhaps more inclined to suggest भामह's indebtedness to दिङ्नाग, if he could only prove it. It is gratifying to note that Dr. Jacobi's hypothesis is not now meeting with that universal approbation which it was at first expected to do. It has been called in question by Dr. J. Nobel[2] and quietly ignored by Dr. B. Bhaṭṭāchārya[3].

1. See his Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, p. XL.

2. 'Die Avantisundarīkathā', Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistic, Bd. V, p. 150.

3. Foreword to शान्तरक्षित's तत्त्वसङ्ग्रह (G. O. S. XXX), pp. LXXIX—LXXX.

The best way for determining whether भामह was indebted to धर्मकीर्ति or not, would have been perhaps the comparison of भामह's views with the peculiar views of धर्मकीर्ति. It is known to all who know anything of mediaeval logic that धर्मकीर्ति, though a follower of दिङ्नाग, did not adopt his views *in toto*. The peculiarities of धर्मकीर्ति have been carefully noted by Dr. Vidyābhūṣaṇa[1] and a reference to these will surely make it clear that no special view of the Buddhist logician has been represented in the work of भामह. On the contrary, there are indications which point diametrically to the opposite side. We may just refer to some of them. The definition of प्रत्यक्ष, as given by दिङ्नाग, is प्रत्यक्षं कल्पनापोढम्[2]। To this an important addition is made by धर्मकीर्ति by saying प्रत्यक्षं कल्पनापोढमभ्रान्तम्[3]. Now the term अभ्रान्तं is not such as can be ignored by any person coming after him. दिङ्नाग's definition was rather too general and consequently could be interpreted to apply to everything, so that everything will be प्रत्यक्ष. उद्योतकर did actually interpret it in this way[4]. To avoid this contingency, धर्मकीर्ति added अभ्रान्तं which made it clear that by प्रत्यक्ष, we were to mean here प्रत्यक्षज्ञानं and nothing else. Who will indulge in such an inexactitude

---

1. See Vidyābhūṣaṇa's History of Indian Logic, pp. 315—318.

2. वाचस्पतिमिश्र in his तात्पर्यटीका, while commenting upon 'अपरे तु मन्यन्ते प्रत्यक्षं कल्पनापोढमिति,' begins, 'सम्प्रति दिङ्नागस्य लक्षणमुपन्यस्यति अपर इति। See also Vidyābhūṣaṇa's History of Indian Logic, pp. 276—277 and Dr. Randle's Fragments from Diṅnāga, pp. 8—10.

3. See न्यायबिन्दु (Benares Edn.), p. 11.

4. He takes it as स्वरूपतो न व्यपदेश्यम्।

when once it has been so pointed out? भामह gives two definitions of प्रत्यक्ष in a single line. It is—

प्रत्यक्षं कल्पनापोढं ततोऽर्थादिति केचन—काव्या० V.6.

one of the two definitions—the first of them—belongs, on the authority of वाचस्पति मिश्र, to दिङ्नाग and the second, on the same authority, to वसुबन्धु[1], the teacher of दिङ्नाग. Now can it be imagined that भामह could have afforded to leave out धर्मकीर्ति's definition, had he been aware of it? Besides, कल्पना is defined by धर्मकीर्ति in a strikingly different way. According to him कल्पना is अभिलापसंसर्गयोग्यप्रतिभासप्रतीतिः[2]. But उद्योतकर, while discussing दिङ्नाग's definition of प्रत्यक्ष, says: 'अथ केयं कल्पना? नामजातियोजनेति। यत् किल न नाम्नाभिधीयते न च जात्यादिभिर्व्यपदिश्यते।'[3] वाचस्पतिमिश्र calls it लक्षणवादिनामुत्तरम्[4]. Now the लक्षणवादीs must be दिङ्नाग and all those who had a similar view. We may presume that भामह was also one of them—at least conversant with the view—for he says कल्पनां नामजात्यादियोजनां प्रतिजानते-काव्या० V. 6. It may be admitted that धर्मकीर्ति's definition of कल्पना is more academic in tone exactly as his definition of प्रत्यक्ष is more exact in expression. If भामह could afford to give two views on an important issue, he would not, we think, mind to give a third one also, if it was more useful and suitable, as धर्मकीर्ति's definitions indeed are.

---

1. वाचस्पतिमिश्र begins his comment upon 'अपरे पुनर्वर्णयन्ति ततोऽर्थाद् विज्ञानं प्रत्यक्षम्। तदेवं प्रत्यक्षलक्षणं समर्थ्य वासुबन्धवं तावत् प्रत्यक्षलक्षणं विकलयितुमुपन्यस्यति-ता० p. 99. See also Dr. Randle's Fragments from Diṅnāga, p. 12—13.

2. न्यायबिन्दु, p. 13.

3. न्यायवार्तिक, p. 44.

4. तात्पर्यटीका, p. 102.

One thing more should be noted in this connection. As far as we know, धर्मकीर्ति has nowhere in his extant works shown any regard to the views of वसुबन्धु, though his pupil, दिङ्नाग, is his great authoritative source. But भामह has referred to the views of the older logician in unmistakable language. May we not assume with probability that, by the time of धर्मकीर्ति, वसुबन्धु had been somewhat eclipsed by his decidedly abler pupil? It is quite possible that भामह lived in an age when वसुबन्धु was not so forgotten. He still commanded respectful attention from scholars along with दिङ्नाग.

It will be undoubtedly quite profitable to give here the results of a detailed comparison of these works; but we are afraid the space at our disposal will not permit it. We may, in passing, just note a few points. भामह has six पक्षाभासs[1] but धर्मकीर्ति has only four.[2] If we were to look into न्यायप्रवेश we shall find no less than nine.[3] But what is very interesting to note is that some of the definitions and examples of भामह wholly correspond with those in न्यायप्रवेश। दृष्टान्त is included by धर्मकीर्ति in त्रिरूपहेतु[4] but भामह takes it separately[5] exactly as we find it in न्यायप्रवेश and प्रमाणसमुच्चय। In न्यायप्रवेश and प्रमाणसमुच्चय we further find दृष्टान्त divided into two classes according to the way they are possible either by साधर्म्य or वैधर्म्य[6]। This is also the case with भामह। But धर्मकीर्ति has

---

1. काव्यालङ्कार, v. 13-20.
2. न्यायबिन्दु, pp. 84-85.
3. न्यायप्रवेश—See in the History of Indian Logic, pp. 290-291
4. त्रिरूपो हेतुरुक्तः। तावतैवार्थप्रतीतिरिति न पृथग् दृष्टान्तो नाम साधनावयवः कश्चित्। तेन नास्य लक्षणं पृथगुच्यते—न्यायबिन्दु, p. 117.
5. काव्यालङ्कार, v. 21, v. 26-27.
6. History of Indian Logic, pp. 286-7, 295—6. In these

no such division. The few points, noted above, are quite sufficient to convince any unprejudiced person that भामह's borrowing from धर्मकीर्ति is any thing but possible.

Even if these points were not available, we could have shown that भामह's coming after धर्मकीर्ति cannot be imagined. धर्मकीर्ति, as shown above, lived about 650 A. C. and hailed from the South of India. शान्तरक्षित lived in Bengal in the beginning of the 8th century. Now, we cannot, with any stretch of our imagination, conceive that within half a century such a progress could be possible in those days of hard communication. धर्मकीर्ति becomes sufficiently famous, his works are carried to Kashmir, there भामह utilises them for writing his own work, then he also becomes well-known, his work reaches Bengal and is devoured by शान्तरक्षित—and all this was accomplished within half a century! It seems to be hardly possible. We have no reason, therefore, to doubt आनन्दवर्द्धन's statement that बाण was acquainted with भामह's work, so that 600 A.C. can be safely taken to be the lower limit of भामह's date.

But what should be his upper limit? The fore-going discussion has shown that भामह was familiar with the views, which are, on the authority of वाचस्पतिमिश्र, ascribed to दिङ्नाग। We have further shown that his views sometimes correspond with those which are found in न्यायप्रवेश। Nanjio[1] and Takakusu[2] ascribe this work to नागार्जुन। But Pandit Vidhuśekhara Bhaṭṭāchārya thinks that Nanjio "has

---

cases resemblance in phraseology is also to be noted. धर्मकीर्ति has, however, got such a division in दृष्टान्ताभास.

1. Nanjio's Catalogue of the Chinese Tripiṭaka, p. 270, Nos. 1223, 1224.

2. A Record of the Buddhist Religion by Itsing, pp. 177, 186.

made a mistake in rendering the name into Sanskrit. The name, as given in Chinese in the book itself, is Yü luṅ, the Sanskrit equivalent of which is Diṅnāga."[1] But, according to Sugiura[2] and Ui,[3] न्यायप्रवेश is attributed by the Chinese tradition to शङ्करस्वामी। दिङ्नाग's work, according to this view, was न्यायद्वार, quite distinct from न्यायप्रवेश. Dr. Randle[4] sees ' no reason to doubt the correctness of the Chinese attribution of the न्यायद्वार to Diṅnāga. That being the case, it is impossible that Diṅnāga should have been the author of न्यायप्रवेश. ' But we see no reason to doubt the correctness of the Tibetan attribution of the न्यायप्रवेश to दिङ्नाग। If that be the case, it is impossible that any other person but दिङ्नाग should have been the author of the न्यायप्रवेश। Besides many cogent arguments so ably put forward by Pandit Vidhuśekhara Bhaṭṭāchārya[5] for proving that न्यायप्रवेश was the work of दिङ्नाग, one thing appears to turn the scale to a very great extent. It is a curious fact that शङ्करस्वामी was not known to either Houen Tsang or Itsing. The Tibetan texts are quite ignorant of his name. The Tibetan translation of the Chinese translation of न्यायप्रवेश clearly shows that at that time even the Chinese did not know of शङ्करस्वामी। It is really inexplicable how they came, later on, to associate his name with न्यायप्रवेश। There seems to be some baffling confusion, lurking somewhere or other. Unless and until this mystery is cleared up, we shall not know the real ground of its attribution by the

1. ' The Nyāya Praveśa of Diṅnāga, ' Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. III, p. 154.

2. Hindu Logic as preserved in China and Japan, pp. 36–37.

3. Vaiśeṣika Philosophy, p. 68.

4. Fragments from Diṅnāga, p. 61.

5. Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. III, pp. 154–159.

Chinese to शङ्करस्वामी। But so far as the Tibetan Text,[1] as edited by Pandit Vidhuśekhara Bhaṭṭāchārya, is concerned, it is more than probable that it is the work of दिङ्नाग। The learned editor has compared it with the Chinese and Sanskrit Versions and does not perhaps find material difference between them. So what is said of the Tibetan version with regard to its authorship, may be, therefore, true of other versions as well.[2] We have every hope that this puzzling enigma will be cleared up by Principal Dhruva's Introduction to the Sanskrit Version of the न्यायप्रवेश[3] ।

It does not, however, matter much for us even if शङ्करस्वामी was to be proved the author of न्यायप्रवेश। He is said to have been the pupil of दिङ्नाग and consequently must have been his younger contemporary. So when we find clear resemblance of certain views and expressions in भामह's work from the works of दिङ्नाग and न्यायप्रवेश, we can, without hesitation, say that दिङ्नाग's date will furnish the upper limit to भामह's age.

The date of दिङ्नाग depends upon the date of his teacher, वसुबन्धु। Nanjio informs us that कुमारजीव wrote a life of वसुबन्धु[4] between A. C. 401 and 409 and परमार्थ, who lived between A.C. 499 and 560, wrote another.[5] From

---

1. Gaekwad Oriental Series, XXXIX Part II.

2. Dr. N. D. Minorov contributes a paper on 'Diṅnāga's Nyāya Praveśa and Haribhadra's commentary on it,' to the volume presented to Dr. Garbe. We have not as yet seen it, but from the title we may assume that he is also inclined to attribute न्यायप्रवेश to दिङ्नाग।

3. G. O. S. XXXIX Part I.

4. Nanjio's Catalogue of the Chinese Tripiṭaka, app. I. 64.

5. Ibid No. 1463.

परमार्थ[1] we know that वसुबन्धु was a contemporary of विक्रमादित्य, who is identified by V. A. Smith[2] with Chandra Gupta I of the Gupta Dynasty. If this line of argument is followed, as has been done by V. A. Smith[3] and M. Peri[4], वसुबन्धु, who died, it is said, at the age of 80, will be found to have been living between 280-360 A.C. But unfortunately all scholars are not at one. Different scholars assign different dates to वसुबन्धु । The other most important view is that which places him between 420—500 A. C.[5] But the majority of the scholars[6] appears to be inclined towards the former view. Undoubtedly that view appears, to say the least, much more probable. If we were to subscribe to the other view, the whole subsequent chronology becomes awfully disturbed. Then we have to look upon कुमारजीव's 'Life of Vasubandhu' as a myth and disbelieve the traditions which make वसुबन्धु one of the Patriarchs and his work as having been translated into Chinese by कुमारजीव ।

So we have seen above that there is every probability of वसुबन्धु having lived between 280 and 360 A. C. Now दिङ्नाग, being his pupil, must have been his junior contemporary and so must have lived somewhere before 400. Now, if 400 A. C. is to be the approximate date of दिङ्नाग, that date must also be considered to furnish the upper limit to भामह's date. We may, therefore, safely say

---

1. Takakusu, J. R. A. S., 1905, p. 44.
2. Early History of India, 3rd Edn., p. 320.
3. Ibid, pp. 328 ff.
4. Bull. de l.' Ecole francaise d' Extreme-orient, XI. 355 ff.
5. Vidyābhūṣaṇa's History of Indian Logic, pp. 266—267.
6. Keith—Indian Logic and Atomism, p. 98, Buddhist Philosophy p. 155 ; B. Bhaṭṭacharya's Foreword to तत्त्वसंग्रह (G. O. S. XXX) pp. LXVI—LXXX.

that भामह must have lived between the dates of दिङ्नाग and बाण, viz., between 400 and 600 A. C.

If we wish to be a little more exact with regard to the date of भामह, we should try to find out whether he was nearer to दिङ्नाग or to धर्मकीर्ति। We have already shown that his views correspond much more with those of दिङ्नाग than those of धर्मकीर्ति। We have further shown that he was living in an age when the old teachers were not as yet forgotten. This fact can be further borne out by a careful comparison of his work with the extant works of those teachers. At some places he has referred the reader for details to other works which are not found perhaps in दिङ्नाग's works. We have further to take into consideration that भामह's fame must have taken some time for becoming so much ripe as to induce a poet of Kanouj, as बाण indeed was, to become acquainted with the work of the great Kashmirian. If we may be permitted to allow a century for it, we shall be, we thihk, not wrong in placing भामह before 500 A. C. But the way he writes, the atmosphere he breathes, the company he keeps,—all these leave us still unsatisfied. We are very much tempted to think that he was not far removed from दिङ्नाग, though we cannot positively prove it by direct evidence. The fifth chapter of his काव्यालङ्कार, teeming so much with philosophical logic, rather smacking much more, as it were, of polemics, makes us believe that he was living in an age which was permeated with debate and controversy in every quarter. Such a period in Indian History was possible only with such scholars as दिङ्नाग। We know from accounts[1], preserved here and

---

1. Lama Tārānātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus von Schierfner, pp. 130—135; Vidyābhūṣṇa's History of Indian Logic, pp. 272-274.

there, that the great आचार्य spent his whole life in vehement शास्त्रार्थ—heated controversy and debate. He was known in his times as तर्कपुङ्गव or a fighting bull. But such an age did not last for a long time. By the time of दण्डी, न्यायनिर्णय or settling the logic of poetry, which was considered so very necessary an appendage in a work on Poetics by भामह, came to be considered as a useless कर्कशविचार[1] । Even in the time of बाण, we find no indication of the continuation of दिङ्नाग's age of passionate debate and heated controversy. Further, no indication to that effect has been furnished even by the 5th and 6th century inscriptions of the Guptas. Thus we are not far wrong in believing that that age of controversy almost came to an end with दिङ्नाग । Hence we may conclude that भामह was either a contemporary of or came immediately after दिङ्नाग, who, we know, became widely known throughout the country on account of his incessant wanderings on controversy tours.[2] Consequently we may state that भामह was, with all probability, living about 400 A. C. or, if न्यायप्रवेश happens to be proved the work of शंकरस्वामी, a few years later.

भामह's WORKS

It is indeed very difficult—if not wholly impossible—to determine whether our author had written any other work besides the well-known काव्यालङ्कार । We find, no doubt, the name of भामह associated with certain quotations which are not traceable in the काव्यालङ्कार । राघवभट्ट, in his commentary, अर्थद्योतनिका, on अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तल, quotes twice in the name of भामह extracts which are nowhere to be found in the काव्यालङ्कार । One of them appears to have

---

1. विचारः कर्कशः प्रायस्तेनालीढेन किं फलम्–काव्यादर्श

2. Tāranātha's Geschichte des Buddhismus von Schiefner.

been taken from a work on Metrics[1] and the other from some work on Poetics[2]. The latter sentence, curiously enough, is met with, with slight modifications, in the **अलङ्कारसारसंग्रह** of **उद्भट** and its example in **काव्यप्रकाश।** Some ślokas are quoted by **नारायणभट्ट** in his commentary on **वृत्तरत्नाकर** in the name of **भामह।** These seem to have been taken from a work on Metrics[3].

---

1. क्षेमं सर्वगुरुर्दत्ते मगणो भूमिदैवतः इति भामहोक्तेः p. 4. (नि० सा० edition).
2. तल्लक्षणमुक्तं भामहेन—पर्यायोक्तं प्रकारेण यदन्येनाभिधीयते। वाच्यवाचकशक्तिभ्यां शून्येनावगमात्मना। इति। उदाहृतं च हयग्रीववधस्थं पद्यं 'यं प्रेक्ष्य चिररूढापि निवासप्रीतिरुज्झिता। मदेनैरावणमुखे मानेन हृदये हरेः' इति। p. 10.
3. तदुक्तं भामहेन—

    अवर्णात् सम्पत्तिर्भवति मुदिवर्णाद्धनशता-
    न्युवर्णादख्यातिः सरभसमृवर्णाद्धिरहितात्।
    तथा ह्येचः सौख्यं ङञणरहितादक्षरगणात्
    पदादौ विन्यासात् भरबहलहाहाविरहितात्॥

    वृत्तरत्नाकर, p. 6 (Benares Edition).

    तदुक्तं भामहेनैव—

    देवतावाचकाः शब्दा ये च भद्रादिवाचकाः।
    ते सर्वे नैव निन्द्याः स्युर्लिपितो गणतोऽपि वा॥
    कः खो गो घश्च लक्ष्मीं वितरति वियशो ङस्तथा चः सुखं छः
    प्रीतिं जो मित्रलाभं भयमरणकरौ झञौ टठौ खेददुःखे।
    डः शोभां ढो विशोभां भ्रमणमथ च णस्तः सुखं थश्च युद्धं
    दो धः सौख्यं मुदं नः सुखभयमरणक्लेशदुःखं पवर्गः॥
    यो लक्ष्मीं रश्च दाहं व्यसनमथ लवौ शः सुखं षश्च खेदं
    सः सौख्यं हश्च खेदं विलयमपि च ळः क्षः समृद्धिं करोति।
    संयुक्तं चेह न स्यात् सुखमरणपटुर्वर्णविन्यासयोगः
    पद्यादौ गद्यवक्त्रे वचसि च सकले प्राकृतादौ समोऽयम्॥

    वृत्तरत्नाकर p. 7.

Besides these extracts, coming down to us in the name of भामह, presumably taken from works now wholly lost, we have a well-known commentary on प्राकृतप्रकाश, the Prakrit Grammar written in sutras by वररुचि. It is called प्राकृतमनोरमा and is considered to be the oldest commentry now extant[1].

We have no direct evidence to prove or disprove that it was the author of काव्यालङ्कार who wrote the works referred to above. Who can say if there were not several persons bearing the same common appellation? But it is not every person bearing a similar name who is equally famous. The author of the प्राकृतमनोरमा, however, has been identified by somewith the writer of काव्यालङ्कार. Dr. Pischel[2] following Peterson[3] did not even doubt, that the two भामहs might be different. He says—" Der. älteste commentator is Bhāmaha, ein Kaschmirer, der auch Rhetor und Dichter war. " As far as we can see, their opinion seems to have been based upon the hearsay of the Pandits. Howsoever reliable their views may be, we would very much wish that they were backed by historical evidence, so that they could be pronounced as perfectly definite. But it appears at the same time simply impossible to believe that such a versatile scholar, as the author of काव्यालङ्कार seems to have been, could have remained perfectly idle before or after the writing of his brilliant work on Rhetoric. So, in a word, we do not find ourselves in a position to pronounce any definite opinion either this way or that way.

---

1. Pischel's Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen, p. 35.
2. Ibid.
3. सुभाषितावली, p. 79; See also Aufrecht's Catalogus Catalogorum and Pischel's Rudrata p, 6 f.

काव्यालङ्कार.

We wish very much that we could discuss thoroughly and examine critically the learned and interesting contents of the काव्यालङ्कार, but the consideration of space does not permit us to enlarge upon this topic at any great length. It is enough to remember here that भामह has divided his work into six परिच्छेदs or sections treating of five topics. They are as under—

1. काव्यशरीर. To this section 60 verses have been devoted. They dispose of a few general questions about poetry, its use, definition, etc ;

2. अलङ्कारs. This topic consists of the definitions and illustrations of the Figures of Speech. It is interesting to meet here with a few names of poets who are now wholly unknown. This portion covers 160 verses ;

3. दोषs. Here भामह discusses the demerits of poetic compositions in 50 verses ;

4. न्यायनिर्णय—Here he tries to settle the logical foundation of poetry. Really speaking, this section and the section following form parts of the discussions on the demerits of compositions. But as Logic and Grammar appear to have been reigning supreme in his days, the author was led to devote, unlike many others, special sections to them. This section has for its share 70 verses ;

5. शब्दशुद्धि—Here the author tries to instruct the would-be poets to take care of and avoid the grammatical mistakes which are ever so prone to creep in. This section has 60 verses[1].

---

1. भामह himself has summed up the whole thing at the end of his काव्यालङ्कार—

षष्ट्या शरीरं निर्णीतं शतषष्ट्या त्वलङ्कृतिः।
पञ्चाशता दोषदृष्टिः सप्तत्या न्यायनिर्णयः ॥

भामह—His Place in the History of Sanskrit Poetics.

We have seen, at the very outset, in what a great esteem भामह has all along been held by almost all the great writers on Sanskrit Poetics. He is found quoted in the works of उद्भट, वामन, कुन्तक, आनन्दवर्धन, अभिनवगुप्त, मम्मट and many others of different times and divergent views. With equal regard he has been often referred to by such writers of eminence as the authors of अलङ्कारसर्वस्व, प्रतापरुद्रीय, एकावली and others[1]. This fact cannot but rouse a sense of inquisitiveness in our hearts to study the work of भामह as thoroughly as to find out his merits of such a stable and enduring attraction. But this is not an easy thing as it will necessitate a thorough review of the important Ālaṁkārika works for comparison as well as for tracing their indebtedness to our poetician. But the consideration of this topic may find a fitting place in a History of Sanskit Poetics and not in a paper like this. All that we can do is to take a brief historical survey of our subject and determine as correctly as possible the place occupied therein by भामह ।

षष्ठ्या शब्दस्य शुद्धिः स्यादित्येवं वस्तुपञ्चकम् ।
उक्तं षड्भिः परिच्छेदैर्भामहेन क्रमेण वः ॥

For the detailed description of the contents, see Kāṇe's Introduction to साहित्यदर्पण, pp. XVI–XVII ; for a critical review of the contents the reader is referred to Trivedi's excellent paper "Some Notes on Bhāmaha" in Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume and Dr. De's History of Sanskrit Poetics, Vol. II, pp. 401--412.

1. For such details see Trivedi's article in Indian Antiquary, Vol. XLII (1913) and also his Introduction to प्रतापरुद्र-यशोभूषण.

The worship of सरस्वती—the service of the Poetic Muse—has been from very early times one of the favourite hobbies of the Aryan people. Even the oldest attempt at poetry by the primeval ancestors of the human race—the ऋग्वेद—contains many sparkling gems of genuine poetry. It appears that the Aryans had undoubtedly an artistic conception of poetry from the very beginning, for we meet even in the earliest poems, with expressions of such exquisite aesthetic charm as have been later on elaborately treated of in the works of Poetics as अलङ्कारs or figures of speech[1].

We find a treatment of उपमा in the निरुक्त of यास्क[2], who, at one place, refers to a quite workable definition of this figure given by गार्ग्य[3] । यास्क gives further such divisions of उपमा[4] which seem to have been the fore-runners of the subtle distinctions made later on. By the time of पाणिनि such technical words as उपमान, उपमेय etc. had become perfectly well-established[5]. We find further a reference to

---

1. See ऋग्वेद I. 124. 7; I. 164. 20; I. 164. 11. See also कठोपनिषत् I. 3. 3. and मुण्डकोपनिषत् II 2 3. Besides these, we may also refer to the several hymns containing charming dialogues, known as संवाद hymns found in the ऋग्वेद. See especially X. 108; III. 33. These hymns have been considered as the fore-runners of the Sanskrit Drama by Dr. Oldenberg and others.
2. I. 4; III. 13-18; IX. 6.
3. अथात उपमा यदतत् तत्सदृशमिति गार्ग्यः । तदासां कर्म ज्यायसा वा गुणेन प्रख्याततमेन वा कनीयांसं वाप्रख्यातं वोपमिमीते, अथापि कनीयसा ज्यायांसम् । —निरुक्त, III. 13.
4. III. 13-18; IX. 6.
5. See पाणिनि's अष्टाध्यायी II. 1. 55-56.; II. 3. 72.

नटसूत्रs in the grammer of पाणिनि[1] which, whatever their character, must have had something to do with the actors. Further, tradition credits पाणिनि with the authorship of two महाकाव्यs known as पातालविजय and जाम्बवती विजय[2] though, it is still an open question whether the Gramarian and the Poet were one and the same[3]. From the वार्तिक of कात्यायन it is evident that such a division of काव्य as आख्यायिका had already come into existence[4]. पतञ्जलि, the author of the महाभाष्य on Panini's Sutras, has fortunately left many clues by which one can safely surmise that literary activities had been the characteristic of that age. He refers to one महाकाव्य[5] three आख्यायिकाs[6] and two नाटकs[7] by name, besides many quotations and references of undoubted literary significance[8].

These early grammatical works, as we have seen above do not fail to make us infer that the secular literature had begun to thrive somewhat luxuriantly even in the early periods of our ancient history. We find additional support to this hypothesis from the रामायण and the महाभारत which

---

1. पाराशर्यशिलालिभ्यां भिक्षुनटसूत्रयोः, IV. 3. 110. ; कर्मन्द-कृशाश्वादिनिः, IV. 3. 111.
2. Winternitz : Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, Vol. III. p. 32.
3. Dr. Peterson : JBRAS, XVII (1889), 57ff, J.R.A.S. 1891, 311. ff ; Pischel : ZDMG, 39, (1885) 95 ff.; R.G. Bhandarkar, JBRAS, XVI, 344.
4. लुबाख्यायिकाभ्यो बहुलम् on the सूत्र, अधिकृत्य कृते ग्रन्थे ।
5. यत्तेन कृतं न च तेन प्रोक्तं वाररुचं काव्यम् । महाभाष्य Vol. II,p 315.
6. They are वासवदत्ता, सुमनोत्तरा and भैमरथी. महाभाष्यVol .II. p. 313.
7. ये तावदेते शोभनिका नामैते प्रत्यक्षं कृष्णं घातयन्ति, प्रत्यक्षं च बलिं बन्धयन्तीति । Vol II, p. 34 and 36.
8. Indian Historical Quarterly Vol II, pp. 464—470

contain a very large number of highly poetic passages. Some of these are found quoted in the later authoritative works on Poetics[1].

The रामायण can be considered as a काव्य both from its form and its matter. It is deservedly called an आदिकाव्य Various dates have been assigned to these two epics by different scholars. Dr. Jacobi places रामायण in the 6th century B.C[2]. The अर्थशास्त्र of कौटिल्य contains a number of references which clearly prove the existence of literary activities in his days[3].

It is not conceivable that with the writing of so much poetry, no speculation about the nature, function, division of poetry could have been going on side by side. That we are not wrong in indulging in such an inference can be clearly made out by looking into the काव्यs and नाटकs of अश्वघोष[4] and by the inscriptions dating 2nd century on wards.

---

1. See ध्वन्यालोक, pp. 63, 125, 238 and काव्यप्रकाश, उल्लास IV
2. Dr. Jacobi : Das Ramayana
3. See Winternitz : Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, Bd. III. p. 369. See also अर्थशास्त्र (Jolly and Schmidt's Edn. p. 145 f.
4. The contents of his works fully bear out the supposition that he was conversant with the dicta of अलङ्कारशास्त्र. His काव्यs are divided into सर्गs which, as required, have different metres in the end. His fragmentary dramatic work is called by himself a प्रकरण, just as his two extant काव्यs are styled as महाकाव्यs. These few points along with many other minor ones, are quite significant in the case of a Buddhist preacher. For details see Kāṇe-Indian Antiquary 1912, p. 127 ; also Winternitz—Geschichte der indischen Litteratur, Vol. III, pp. 33, 34.

The inscriptions of रुद्रदामन्[1] which may be considered beyond doubt the earliest of such literary inscriptions betray both from their form and contents their acquaintance with speculations on Poetics. Though no work has actually come down to us, we can find out from the नाट्यशास्त्र of भरत[2] and decidedly from काव्यालङ्कार of भामह[3] that a very large number of the writers on the subject had already contributed their quota for formulating regular theories of Poetics and Dramaturgy. It is not possible to determine with perfect satisfaction as to which of the two—Poetics and Dramaturgy—preceded the other. There seems to be, however, some probability that the Dramaturgy

---

1. See Epigraphica Indica Vol. VIII. 36. The inscription which is most useful for our purpose is found at Junagarh and dated 150 A.C. It is not only written in a poetic style of a high merit but contains many words and phrases which clearly betray their unmistakable acquaintance with some extinct works on Poetics. The following few words may be taken by way of specimen. सर्वक्षत्राविष्कृतवीरशब्दजातोत्सेकाविधेयानां यौधेयानां प्रसह्योत्सादकेन ··· शब्दार्थगान्धर्वन्यायाद्यानां विद्यानां महतीनां पारणधारण विज्ञानप्रयोगावाप्तविपुलकीर्तिना ········ स्फुटलघुमधुरचित्रकान्तशब्दसमयोदारालङ्कृतगद्यपद्य ··· स्वयमधिगतमहाक्षत्रपनाम्ना नरेन्द्रकन्यास्वयंवरानेकमाल्यप्राप्तदाम्ना महाक्षत्रपेण रुद्रदाम्ना । In this connection the Gupta Inscriptions are also of great interest.
2. The present text, even though going by the name of भरत, scarcely seems to be the work of one man. Its contents betray frequent handling and rehandling and the incorporation of matters by persons of different dates. See P. R. Bhāndārkar—Indian Antiquary Vol. XLI ; Kāṇe—Indian Antiquary, Vol. XLVI.
3. Trivedi—Introduction to प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण and Indian Antiquary, Vol. XLII.

went somewhat ahead of Poetics. The conception of a complete poetry was primarily essentially dramatic[1] and consequently Rhetoric proper fell within the folds of Dramaturgy[2]. But with the growth of literature, काव्य could not always remain subservient to drama. It claimed an independent consideration for itself, so that in course of time it began to include dramas within its own folds[3].

The history of Sanskrit Poetics can, therefore, he conveniently studied in these three stages, viz., (i) the first stage when the consideration of Rhetoric fell under Dramaturgy, (ii) the second stage when the two claimed independently separate considerations[4], (iii) the third stage when Dramaturgy came to be considered under Poetics. The first stage was characterised by the simple and the crude speculations as is quite natural for a growing science at its outset. The third stage covers the period of speculative elaboration and consequently of a relative perfection[5].

---

1. See नाट्यशास्त्र, XVI, 118 (काव्यमाला Edition). The theory is upheld by वामन in his काव्यालङ्कारसूत्र I. 3. 30-32 and अभिनवगुप्त in his अभिनवभारती (Chapter VI) where he says—काव्यं तावन्मुख्यतो दशरूपकात्मकमेव ।.........सर्गबन्धादौ हि नायिकाया अपि संस्कृतैवोक्तिरित्यादि बहुतरमनुचितम् ।

2. The काव्य may be taken to be, according to भरत, one of the four constituents of a drama. It is called पाठ्यम् and is said to have been derived from ऋग्वेद । See नाट्यशास्त्र I, 17. It is for this reason that देाषs, गुणs, अलङ्कारs etc. claim only a partial treatment in the नाट्यशास्त्र । See नाट्यशास्त्र अध्याय XVI.

3. अग्निपुराण, Chapter 337 and साहित्यदर्पण परिच्छेद VI.

4. See भामह's काव्यालङ्कार I. 24.

5. Really speaking the conception of रस may be taken to be the determining factor of these various stages. It was at first thought that complete रसानुभूति was possible from only a dramatic work by way of a combined effect of dialogues,songs

It was in the second stage that the real formative work was undertaken and accomplished.[1] This stage can be further considered under two sub-stages, the first of which had much to do with speculations on what is called the शरीर and the second on the आत्मा of poetry. It was आनन्द-वर्धनाचार्य, the well-known poetician of Kāshmir, who initiated and laid a firm foundation of the theory about the आत्मा of poetry, namely, ध्वनि ।

We have no data to determine the name and time of the author who, for the first time, undertook a scientific study of the शरीर of poetry. We may, however, claim

---

and acting. The काव्य, even after becoming a little more independently popular, could only be thought as generating the चमत्कार of शब्द and अर्थ and not of रस । This explains why we miss the treatment of रस in the works of भामह, दण्डी, वामन and others. But with the advent of the ध्वनि School of आनन्दवर्धन, a new conception of रस stepped in and decided the fate of the later development. The रस was no more to be thought of as कार्य or ज्ञाप्य by means of a dramatic action but as व्यङ्ग्य, being suggested primarily by the words themselves. See अभिनवभारती on नाट्यशास्त्र (Chapter VI).

1. The histrionic considerations had such an upperhand over other elements that the writers in the first stage could devote neither time nor attention to a detailed study of काव्य । Theatrical managements and stage arrangements along with the treatment of अभिनय and संगीत in all their elaborately worked-out details, could neither allow them much space nor time for anything else. It has been quite natural in the growth of every science and art that as soon as it becomes liberated from a subordinate position under its genre, it begins to claim attention from all sides and consequently to achieve wide ramifications. Such has also been the case with our काव्य ।

from the evidence of the later writers of note that the great exponent of such rhetorical speculations was no other person than the great भामह himself. There is no doubt that a number of writers on this subject[1] preceded भामह but perhaps the quality of their work as shown by the negligence shown to them by even the earlier writers of subsequent times, did not reach a very high water-mark. And it is quite natural. We cannot expect to find that scientific treatment in the infancy of a subject which becomes a necessary characteristic of it as it gradually develops. So we should not be wrong, if, from the reverence shown to भामह and negligence to his predecessors, we were to infer that the first work on Poetics written on a strictly scientific plan was that of भामह। He seems to have judiciously assimilated the material available in the writings[2] of his predecessors and with the help of a creative genius which he undoubtedly possessed, arranged them on a sound basis with due elaboration and fitting limitation. The employment of this method has been in his case, as shown by the result, an unqualified success. The views which he held, the theories which he propounded, mostly stood the test of time and criticism to such an extent that they were later on upheld by the greatest masters of the subject.

---

1. भामह refers to रामशर्मा in काव्या०, II. 19, 58, to मेधावी in II 40, 88, to शाखवर्धन II. 47. We meet with a number of names which have been referred to as high authorities on Poetics in the काव्यमीमांसा of राजशेखर। Some of them are these—सुरानन्द, श्यामदेव, आपराजिति, द्रौहिणि and आनन्द। No work has come down to us under their names.

2 भामह refers to अच्युतोत्तर of रामशर्मा in II. 19, 58, to राजमित्र of शाखवर्धन in II. 45, III. 10 and to an anonymous work called रत्नाहरण in III. 8.

It will not be, we think, out of place to take this opportunity and point out the salient features of भामह's work by referring to a few instances of such a nature.

The definition of poetry (काव्य) has all along been a matter of great controversy with the writers on Sanskrit Poetics. The easiest and the most convenient expression for denoting what broadly speaking काव्य represents has been given by भामह which is शब्दार्थौ काव्यम्[1] । It is given by मम्मट[2], the author of काव्यप्रकाश, with certain qualifications. It is in fact in these qualifications[3] that the germs of divergence, which different schools of Poetics show in point of views they propound, exist.

The same observatition may be made with regard to the divison of गुणs. The गुणs as given in भरत's नाट्यशास्त्र[4] as also in the काव्यादर्श of दण्डी[5] are ten in number. वामन[6] doubles the number by assigning them both to शब्द and अर्थ । But all the later poeticians of note have had only three गुणs including all the others in them[7]. But the first person who could point out that the three गुणs—माधुर्य, ओजस् and प्रसाद—were all-in-all was भामह[8] । There has been no doubt,

---

1. काव्यालङ्कार I. 16.
2. काव्यप्रकाश Chapter I.
3. See समुद्रबन्ध's commentary on अलङ्कारसर्वस्व p. 4 (Trivendrum Edn.) He writes thus...विशिष्टौ शब्दार्थौ काव्यम् । तद् वैशिष्ट्यं धर्ममुखेन, व्यापारमुखेन, व्यङ्ग्यमुखेनेति त्रयः पक्षाः etc.
4. नाट्यशास्त्र p. 211 (Benares Edn.).
5. काव्यादर्श Chapter I.
6. काव्यालङ्कारसूत्र
7. See काव्यप्रकाश Chapter VIII, साहित्यदर्पण Chapter VIII.
8. काव्यालङ्कार II. 1-3.

some difference of opinion[1] regarding the meaning of these words but as far as the comprehensiveness of the division is concerned भामह's views has stood well.

The next thing which we are to note in this connection is the consideration of वक्रोक्ति by भामह । वक्रोक्ति has played an important part in the history of Sanskrit Poetics. If we were to take into consideration the various modes and forms which वक्रोक्ति has assumed in different times, it may be said to have a history of its own. It was indeed कुन्तक who made much of वक्रोक्ति and founded a new school by writing his वक्रोक्तिजीवित [2] । But as for as our knowledge goes, भामह has been the first person to speak of वक्रोक्ति । वक्रोक्ति, as treated of by भामह [3], has not exactly the same signification as it had with कुन्तक but he was undoubtedly the fore-runner of कुन्तक in recognising it at least as a vital element of poetic compositions[4].

The few instances cited above will be, it is believed, sufficient to convince any intelligent person of the high ability and genuine originality of भामह's expositions. This conviction is brought home to us with greater insistence by his clear statements [5] that he duly exercised his critical intelligence before he wrote any thing. Coupled with this high sense of real scholarship, he had, as is evident from his examples, Poetic powers of no mean order. It is indeed

---

1. See काव्यप्रकाश, Chapter VIII.
2. Two Chapters of this work have been ably edited by Dr. S. K. De in Calcutta Oriental Series.
3. काव्यालङ्कार, II. 85.
4. For detailed information about वक्रोक्ति, see the learned Introduction of Dr. S. K. De to वक्रोक्तिजीवित ।
5. काव्यालङ्कार, III. 58, VI. 64.

a rare combination that a person is gifted with profound scholarship, sound critical acumen, and with the abilities of a clear-headed logician, a clever grammarian and above all a master poet. There is no wonder, therefore, that all the writers on Sanskrit Poetics—including even the humble writers of this humble paper—should bow down their heads with a heart full of deep reverence and grateful appreciation before such an august personality.

II THE PRESENT EDITION

The text of भामह's काव्यालङ्कार, as presented in this edition, is based upon the collation of three manuscripts and the printed text which was published as an appendix to प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण by Mr. K. P. Trivedi in the Bombay Sanskrit Series. All the three manuscripts are undoubtedly the transcripts but we are not in a position to indicate very clearly when and where these transcripts were made. We may, however, assume that their originals must have hailed from the South. If we were to compare the various readings, we shall have littile doubt that the differences are nowhere to be found of a very serious nature. They can be easily accounted for as the inaccuracies of the copyists or the corrections made by their owners. It seems to be quite probable that orginally there was only one manuscript available from which all transcipts have been made from time to time. It might have been the one which was deposited in the Maharaja's Sanskrit Library, Trivandrum. Howsoever it may be, the material at our disposal, has, let us hope, enabled us to present a fairly tolerable text. The three manuscripts, which are represented in our foot-notes as क, ख and घ, have very greatly helped us in understanding the text and clearing many obscure readings. Mr.Trivedi's text, referred to by us as ग (along with his foot-notes) has also been of great help in making the selection of suitabale readnigs. How far we have been successful in having the most appropriate readings, we cannot exactly say. If the learned readers find our text of any help to them we shall feel amply rewarded.

The only thing which now remains, is the pleasant duty of expressing our heart-felt gratitude to all those gentlemen from whom we have derived help in some shape or other, First of all, we offer our most respectful

thanks to all those scholars, departed or living, whose writings have been utilised by us in some way or other. Besides these, we should acknowledge with a deep sense of obligation, the help of all those friends, by having discussions with whom, we have much profited. We take this opportunity for acknowledging the help which our esteemed friend, Pandit Keśava Prasad Miśra has rendered to us by lending his manuscript of भामह's काव्यालङ्कार. Our thanks are also due to Babu Jai-Krisṇa Das Gupta, the Proprietor of the Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series, whose untiring energy has always been of great help to us, not only in bringing out such works but also procuring the manuscripts and other required materials.

We shall be, indeed, failing in our duty, if we were to forget in this connection to mention very particularly the two most revered names—we mean those of Principal A. B. Dhruva and Principal G. N. Kaviraj. Principal Dhruva, in spite of many and varions calls upon his precious time, has always ungrudgingly allowed us to take advantage of his wide erudition, mature intellect and ripe experience. Besides his uniformly affectionate kindness towards us, he has found time for contributing a Foreword to the present work. We have great pleasure in having this opportunity of offering our very cordial and respectful thanks to him. We do not know how to express the feelings of our heart which we entertain towards Pandit Gopinath Kaviraj. It is a mater of great satisfaction to us that we find ourselves amongst those few persons who have realised what he really is. Our heart goes up to him in silence with a profonnd feeling of sincere gratitude, genuine admiration and heart-felt reverence,

किमपि प्रास्ताविकम्

केषामपि संस्कृतविद्याजुषां विदुषां–विशेषतः साहित्यसौहित्यपरिष्कृतशेमुषीमतां–सम्भवतो न भवेत् किमपि नवमिव विज्ञापनीयं महालङ्कारिकस्य भामहस्याभिधानीयम् । तद्ग्रन्थमदृष्टवतामपि शास्त्रदृष्टिमतां विपश्चितां काव्यप्रकाशादिपठनपाठनकाले नियतमेव भामहसम्मतेन मतेन लोचनगोचरीभूतेन भवितव्यम् । किञ्चिदपि हृदयावर्जकं वस्तु लेशतो दृष्टं श्रुतं वा सम्पूर्णतयाऽवलोकनाय कमिव नितरां नोत्कण्ठयति ? अतो मन्यामहे यद् भामहीयकाव्यालङ्कारो बहुतरग्रन्थविदितसारोऽपि सर्वाङ्गीणरूपतयाऽनवगतः सर्वानेव संस्कृतसाहित्यरसिकान् केनाप्यलङ्कारसंस्कारेण रहितानिव सचेतसां चेतसि चिरं संभावयति स्म । आशास्महे यदत्र सुलभतया प्रकाशितोऽयं ग्रन्थश्चिरसंचरणकं रणरणकं दूरीकृत्य नवमिव किमपि कामनीयकमुररीकृत्य विश्वेषां विदुषां संमोदाय भवेदिति ।

अथाऽऽलङ्कारिका अनेके बभूवुः । तेषां दर्शनान्यपि परस्परभिन्नान्येव व्यवस्थितानि । तद्यथाह समुद्रबन्धोऽलङ्कारसर्वस्वटीकायां– 'विशिष्टौ शब्दार्थौ काव्यम् । तद् वैशिष्ट्यं धर्ममुखेन, व्यापारमुखेन, व्यङ्ग्यमुखेनेति त्रयः पक्षा' इति । धर्मोऽपि द्विविधो नित्योऽनित्यश्च । अत्रानित्यधर्मोऽलंक्रियतेऽनेनेति करणव्युत्पत्त्या सिद्धोऽलङ्कारः । नित्यधर्मस्तु गुण एव । एवं व्यापारोऽपि द्विविधो वक्रोक्तिर्भावकत्वं च । तदित्थं प्राधान्येन पञ्चरूपतया व्यवस्थितोऽयमालङ्कारिकसमयः । यत्रालङ्कारा एव काव्ये प्रधानं, तैरेव वैशिष्ट्यं काव्यस्य, तैरेवोल्लासिता भगवती कविभणितिः परमचमत्कारचरमभूः, स तावत् प्रथमः पक्ष उद्भटादीनाम् । यत्र पुनर्माधुर्यादिगुणैः परिनिष्ठापितप्राणा रीतिरेवात्मा काव्यस्य, स द्वितीयः पक्षो वामनादीनाम् । यत्र वैदग्ध्यवचनभङ्गिरूपा वक्रोक्तिरेव सहृदयहृदयमुन्मादयन्ती काव्यात् स्यन्दमानानन्दस्य निदानरूपत्वं भजते, स तृतीयः पक्षः कुन्तलादीनाम् । अभिधातो द्वितीयो विभावादीनां साधारणी-

करणात्मको भावकत्वव्यापारः काव्ये यत्र चारुत्वनिष्पत्तिहेतुतामुपयाति, स तुरीयः पक्षो भट्टनायकादीनाम् । यत्र न्यग्भावितवाच्याद्यर्थोऽभिधादिविलक्षणप्रकारेण व्यञ्जनाख्येन व्यापारेणाभिव्यक्तो व्यङ्ग्योऽर्थः काव्यस्य चरमचमत्कारितामादधाति, स पञ्चमः पक्ष आनन्दवर्धनादीनाम् ।

एवमालङ्कारिकाणां मतानां प्रभूतेषु विविधविधेषु भेदेषु सत्स्वपि प्रथमपक्षसंस्थापकानामाचार्याणां विशिष्टोऽपि सन् भामहः सर्वैरेवालङ्कारिकप्रवरैरुपजीव्यतया तत्तद्ग्रन्थेषु परमादरेण संभावितो दरीदृश्यते । अलङ्कारपरिष्कारकर्मोद्भटो भट्टोद्भटो यः काश्मीरकस्य महाराजजयापीडस्य सभायां प्रत्यहं दीनारलक्षेण कृतवेतनो विद्वन्मण्डलमण्डनायमान इवासीत् सोऽपि भामहीयकाव्यालङ्कारस्य भामहविवरणं नाम विख्यातं व्याख्यानं तच्छायां चोपगृह्य स्वमलङ्कारसारसंग्रहं नाम प्रसिद्धालङ्कारसारं च प्रणिनाय ।

भामहस्योपलब्धमितिवृत्तम् ।

सोऽयं भामहाचार्यः कं जनपदं स्वजन्मनाऽलञ्चकार, कस्मिन् काले प्रादुर्बभूव, कथं स्वजीवनं यापयामासेति प्रश्नानधिकृत्य विविधाः किल सन्ति वादिनां विप्रतिपत्तयः । तत्रैकैकं यथायथं वयमालोचयामः ।

तत्र हृद्यावनिरामणीयकस्येव विविधविद्याकामनीयकस्य विश्रमस्थानं कुङ्कुमकेसरप्ररोहाणामिव कविताविलाससमारोहाणां समुल्लासनिधानं शारदादेश एवास्याभिजन इति निपुणं वक्तुं शक्यते । एतस्य काव्यालङ्कारनाम्नो ग्रन्थस्य दक्षिणदेशात् समुपलब्धिमात्रादेव दाक्षिणात्योऽयमिति कथयितुं न कथमपि पार्यते । काश्मीरकाणामाचार्याणां ग्रन्थेष्वेव प्रथममेतस्याभिधानं मतं च समुल्लिखितं परिदृश्यते । पण्डितोद्भटेन येनोद्भटेन भामहीयकाव्यालङ्कारस्य किमप्यपूर्वं साम्प्रतमनुपलभ्यमानं भामहविवरणं नाम विवरणं व्यलेखि स काश्मीरक एवासीदिति विषये नास्ति कोऽपि सन्देहलेशः । तत्रत्यानां पण्डितानां

प्रवादादपि चेदमेवज्ञायते यत् काश्मीरदेशमेवायं स्वजन्मना कामपि माहात्म्यपदवीमारोपितवान् ।

भामहस्य जीवनचरितमवलम्ब्य सूक्ष्मेक्षिकया निपुणं विचारयन्तोऽपि वयं न पारयामः कमपि निश्चितं सिद्धान्तं स्थिरीकर्तुम् । काव्यालङ्कारस्यैवाभ्यन्तरपरीक्षयाऽवगम्यते यदस्य पितुर्नाम रक्रिल गोमीति । भामहः स्वयमेवात्मानं रक्रिलगोमिपुत्रत्वेन काव्यालङ्कारस्यान्तिमे श्लोके समुद्घोषयति—

अवलोक्य मतानि सत्कवीना-
मवगम्य स्वधिया च काव्यलक्ष्म ।
सुजनावगमाय भामहेन
ग्रथितं रक्रिलगोमिसूनुनेदम् ॥

रक्रिलेत्यभिधानस्य सोमिल--राहुल--पोत्तिलेत्यादिप्रख्यातानां बौद्धानां नामभिरभिसंवादात् श्री नरसिंह अयोङ्गारमहोदया बौद्धोऽयमिति सिद्धान्तयन्ति । गोमीति पदममुमेवार्थं द्रढयतीति समर्थयन्ति पण्डितवर्याः काशीनाथ पाठकाः । 'गोमिन् पूज्ये' इति चान्द्रव्याकरणस्य सूत्रेण पूज्यार्थे गोमीति पदं निपात्यते । अतः पूज्यार्थवाचकस्य गोमीतिपदस्य बौद्धानामेवाभिधानेषु प्रशंसार्थं समुपलब्धेर्बौद्ध एवासीत् भामह इति तेषां मतम् ।

अन्यच्च

प्रणम्य सार्वं सर्वज्ञं मनोवाक्कायकर्मभिः ।
काव्यालङ्कार इत्येष यथाबुद्धि विधास्यते ॥

इत्यादिमेन मङ्गलश्लोकेनायमेवार्थो दृढीक्रियते तत्र सर्वज्ञस्य वन्दनीयत्वेन समुल्लेखात् । सर्वज्ञस्तु 'सर्वज्ञः सुगतो बुद्धो मारजिल्लोकजिज्जिनः' इत्यमरसिंहवचनात् भगवतो बुद्धस्यैव नामान्तरम् । सार्वेति पदं सर्वेभ्यो हितमित्यर्थे सर्वशब्दात् णप्रत्ययेन निष्पन्नं भवति । तच्च परोपकारिणामग्रगण्यं भगवन्तं बुद्धमेव समुपक्षिपति । तदित्थं मङ्गलश्लोके बुद्धस्यैव समुल्लेखात् सुतरां निश्चीयते यदस्य रचयिता बौद्ध एवासीदिति ।

निपुणं विभावयतामप्यस्माकं नेदं मतं समीचीनतया सिद्धान्त

पदवीमधिरोहति । तत्र वयमित्थं विचारयामः । 'सर्वज्ञः सुगतो बुद्धः' इत्यमरवचनात् सर्वज्ञो बुद्धस्यैव नामान्तरं न त्वन्यस्य कस्यचन देवस्येति कथमपि वक्तुं न पार्यते । सर्वं जानातीति व्युत्पत्त्या सर्वज्ञपदेन यद्यन्य एव कश्चिद्देवोऽभिमतो भवेत्तर्हि का क्षतिः? कस्मान्नोच्यते यदत्र भगवाञ्छङ्कर एव स्तुतः ? तस्य सर्वज्ञ इति नामान्तरं प्रसिद्धमेव । उक्तं च अमरसिंहेन कृशानुरेताः सर्वज्ञो धूर्जटिर्नीललोहित इति । सिध्यतु चान्द्रीयसूत्रनिपातनात् गोमीति पदं, अभिदधातु च पूज्यतां, परन्तु बौद्धानामेव कृतेऽस्य प्रयोगो नान्येषामित्यस्मिन्नाग्रहे का वाचोयुक्तिः ? गोस्वामीत्यस्य संक्षिप्तमिदं गोमीति रूपमित्यपि केऽपि पण्डिता वदन्ति । तथा च यथा दक्षिणदेशवासिनामाचार्य इति कापि पदवी समुपलभ्यते तथैव भारतस्योत्तरे गोमीति पदं ब्राह्मणानां पदवीरूपेणोपलभ्यमानं दृश्यते इति व्यक्तं प्रतिपादयन्ति कमलाशङ्कर त्रिवेदिमहोदयाः । नामाभिसंवादेनापि न कोऽपि सन्देह विरहितो निश्चय उपगन्तुं शक्यते । किमधुनापि भारते वर्षे वैदिक धर्मावलम्बिनां जनानां विधर्मिणां यवनानां रीत्या नामानि नोपलभ्यन्ते ? विधर्मिणामभिधानैर्यदा साम्प्रतमप्येवं सादृश्यमवलोक्यते, तदा न किमपि विचित्रमिवाभाति नश्चित्ते यत् प्राचामपि केषाञ्चिदार्याणां सह निवसतां बौद्धानामिव नामानि दृश्येरन् ।

अन्यच्च, काव्यालङ्कारे न क्वापि भगवतो बुद्धस्य कापि जीवनघटना केनापि रूपेण समुल्लिखिता दृश्यते । प्रत्युत सर्वत्र रामायणमहाभारतबृहत्कथादीनां प्रख्याताख्यानानां तत्तत्प्रसिद्ध नायकानां च नामानि कर्माणि च स्फुटाक्षरैर्वर्ण्यमानानि समुपलभ्यन्ते । अतो नियतमेव भामहेन वैदिकधर्मावलम्बिना भवितव्यमित्येष एव सिद्धान्तः पूर्वोक्तैः प्रबलतरैः प्रमाणैर्यथातथमुन्नेतुं शक्यः ।

भामहाचार्यस्याऽऽविर्भावकालः ।

साम्प्रतं भामहाचार्यस्याविर्भावकालं संक्षिप्ततया निर्णेतुं प्रवृत्ता वयं प्रथमतस्तावदित्थमुद्भावयामः—

अष्टमशतकस्य मध्यभागे समुत्पन्नेन बौद्धाचार्यशान्तरक्षितेन

स्वीये तत्त्वसंग्रहाभिधाने ग्रन्थे भामहस्य मतमुपदर्शयता तद्-ग्रन्थस्थाः कतिपये श्लोकाः प्रमाणतया विन्यस्ताः समुपलभ्यन्ते। अतोऽस्त्ययं महालङ्कारिकमूर्धन्यः अष्टमशतकात् प्राचीन इति तु निर्विवादमेव।

ध्वनिप्रस्थापकपरमाचार्येण श्रीमदाऽऽनन्दवर्धनेन स्वकीये ध्वन्यालोके भामहीयसमयनिरूपणाय परमसाहाय्यप्रदं रहस्यमेकमभ्यधायि। तत्र चतुर्थोद्योते

दृष्टपूर्वा अपि ह्यर्थाः काव्ये रसपरिग्रहात्।
सर्वे नवा इवाभान्ति मधुमास इव द्रुमाः॥

इति प्रस्तुत्य विवक्षितान्यपरवाच्यस्यैव शब्दशक्त्युद्भवानुरणनरूपव्यङ्ग्यप्रकारसमाश्रयेण नवत्वं भवतीति प्रतिपाद्य ग्रन्थकृदुदाहरति यथा—'धरणीधारणायाधुना त्वं शेषः' इत्यादौ

शेषो हिमगिरिस्त्वं च महान्तो गुरवः स्थिराः।
यदलङ्घितमर्यादाश्चलन्तीं बिभ्रते भुवम्॥

इत्यादिषु सत्स्वपि तस्यैवार्थशक्त्युद्भवानुरणनरूपव्यग्यसमाश्रयेण नवत्वमिति'। अर्थात् 'धरणीधारणायाधुना त्वं शेषः' इत्यस्य शेषो हिमगिरिस्त्वं चेति श्लोकादर्वाचीनत्वेऽपि कस्यापि व्यङ्ग्यस्य स्फुरणात् चरमचत्कारितेति स्फुटमेव शेषो हिमगिरिस्त्वं चेति पद्यस्य कापि प्राचीनता निर्विवादरूपेण द्योत्यते। अथ च धरणीधारणायेत्यादि वाक्यं हर्षचरिते समुपलभ्यते। तेनास्य महाकविबाणकर्तृत्वमनायासेनोन्नेतुं शक्यते। शेषो हिमगिरिस्त्वं चेति पद्यस्यापि भामहीयकाव्यालङ्कारे समुपलब्धेर्भामहनिर्मातृत्वं स्फुटमेवेति वयं प्रतीमः। तेन श्रीमदानन्दवर्धनाचार्येण कृतात् समुल्लेखात् निःसंशयं प्रतीयते यत् तदानीन्तनकाश्मीरकाणां पण्डितानां मते श्रीबाणभट्टात् प्राचीनोऽयमस्माकं भामहाचार्य इति। श्रीबाणभट्टश्च स्थाण्वीश्वरमहाराजहर्षवर्द्धनस्य सभायां वैक्रमसप्तमशताब्द्यामासीदिति साधु कथयन्ति ऐतिहासिकाः। तेन भामहाचार्यः सप्तमशतकात् प्राचीन इति विषये नास्ति सन्देहकणिकाया अप्यवकाशः।

काव्यालङ्कारस्य पञ्चमपरिच्छेदगतस्य न्यायनिर्णयस्य पर्यालोचनया तावदित्थं वयमुन्नयामो यत् न्यायप्रवेशप्रमाणसमुच्चयादिन्यायग्रन्थप्रणेतुः श्रीमतो बौद्धाचार्यात् दिङ्नागात् प्राचीनतामासादयितुं कथमपि नार्हति भामह इति। भामहेन स्वग्रन्थे बहवो न्यायसंबन्धिनो विषयाः प्रतिपादिताः ये दिङ्नागस्य प्रख्यातैः सिद्धान्तैः सह स्फुटमेव संवादं भजन्ते। तत्र प्रमाणानां द्वैविध्यं, प्रत्यक्षस्य कल्पनापोढत्वं, कल्पनायाश्च नामजात्यादियोजनारूपत्वं यत् सर्वं काव्यालङ्कारस्य पञ्चमे परिच्छेदे परिष्कृतरूपतया विवेचितं विद्यते, तत् सर्वं सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्रश्रीवाचस्पतिमिश्राणां तात्पर्यटीकाया वचनप्रमाण्यात् दिङ्नागस्य मतानुगतमेवेति। लिङ्गस्य त्रैरूप्ये, दूषणस्य न्यूनताद्युक्तित्वे, जातीनां च दूषणाभासत्वे भामहस्य दिङ्नागान्नहि कुत्रचित् किमपि पार्थक्यमिव दृश्यते। अन्यदपि बहु न्यायप्रवेशस्थेन सिद्धान्तचयेन साधु सादृश्यमुपभजते इत्युभावपि ग्रन्थौ विवेचनरीत्या परिशीलयतः कस्य विपश्चितः सद्यः स्फुरितमिव न स्यात्। अतो भामहस्य दिङ्नागादर्वाचीनत्वे नास्ति कस्यापि विप्रतिः। श्रीमानाचार्यो वसुबन्धुश्चतुर्थशतके प्रादुरभूदिति तु निश्चितमेव। तच्छिष्य आचार्यदिङ्नागश्च तस्यैव शतकस्योत्तरभागे भारतवर्षमलङ्चकारेति विदितमेवेतिहासज्ञानां विदुषाम्। अत एव दिङ्नागादर्वाचीनत्वेन बाणभट्टाच्च प्राचीनतया श्रीमान् भामहाचार्यश्च तुर्थपञ्चमशतकयोर्मध्यभागे एव प्रादुर्बभूवेति साधु वक्तुं शक्यते।

भामहीया ग्रन्थाः।

अथ के के ग्रन्था भामहेन विरचिता इति विचारयितुमनसामेवास्माकं काचन विद्वज्जनमनोरमा मनोरमानाम्नी वररुचिप्राकृतप्रकाशस्य वृत्तिर्दृष्टिपथमारोहति। सर्वत्रैव विदुषां समाजे भामहेन कृतेयं मनोरमा वृत्तिरिति जागर्त्येव कापि प्रसिद्धिः परन्तु मनोरमायाः कर्ता भामहः काव्यालङ्कारस्य रचयितुर्भामहाद् भिन्नोऽभिन्नो वेति विषये न कोऽपि प्रबलतरप्रमाणैरनुप्राणितः सिद्धान्तः सत्यरूपतया स्थिरीकर्तुं पार्यते। अन्यच्च अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तलस्यार्थद्योतनिकायां टीकायां राघवभट्टश्छन्दःशास्त्र-

सम्बन्धि भामहकर्तृकं वाक्यद्वयं समुद्धरति । श्रीनारायणभट्टेन च वृत्तरत्नाकरस्य टीकायां कतिपये भामहीयाः श्लोकाः प्रमाणतया समुपन्यस्ता दृश्यन्ते । अनेनोल्लखद्वयेन सुतरामेवानुमातुं शक्यते यत् भामहेन कोऽपि छन्दोग्रन्थोऽपि निरमायीति ।

काव्यालङ्कारस्य तु भामहकर्तृत्वे न कस्यापि जातुचिदपि विद्यते सन्देहः। अयमेवनिखिलालङ्कारनिबन्धानामादिमः सकलालङ्कारिकाणामुपजीव्यतामादधानः कोऽप्यपूर्वो ग्रन्थः, यं खलु प्रकाण्डतरुनिभमाधरं समाश्रयन्ती भामहीयकीर्तिवल्लरी सर्वत्रैव जगति विरचितरसिकमनःसंमोदं स्वकीयसरसामोदं वितन्वानेव वरिवर्ति। अस्मिन् खलु ग्रन्थे स्वल्पेऽपि भूयसामलङ्कारसिद्धान्तानां प्रभूतश्चयः विदुषश्चमत्करोति। अत्र सन्ति तावत् षट् परिच्छेदाः, येषु पञ्च आलङ्कारिका विषयाः सुष्ठुतया विवेचिता विद्यन्ते । तत्र तावत् काव्यशरीराख्ये प्रथमे परिच्छेदे काव्यस्य फलं लक्षणं भेदाश्च साधु प्रतिपादितानि सन्ति। शब्दार्थौ काव्यमिति वदता भामहेन शब्दे चार्थे च काव्यत्वं प्रतिपाद्य कापि स्वीया सूक्ष्मा विवेचनशक्तिः प्रदर्शिता। कतिपयानालङ्कारिकानपहाय अनेनैव भामहसम्मतेन मतेन सर्वेषामेवाभिमतेन भूयते इति तु विदितमेव साहित्याकलनजुषां विदुषाम्। द्वितीये परिच्छेदे ग्रन्थकृत् प्रथमतस्तावत् गुणं लक्षयित्वा तस्य त्रैविध्यं प्रतिपादयति। भरतोक्तानां दशानामपि गुणानामत्रैव त्रिष्वेवान्तर्भावात् त्रय एवैते गुणा इति भामहमतानुसारेणैव प्रवर्तते मम्मटादीनामपि सरणिः। अनन्तरं द्वितीयस्यावशिष्टेऽशे समग्रे च तृतीये भामहोऽलङ्काराणां भेदानेव विस्तुतरूपेण विवेचयति। तत्र

'सैषा सर्वत्र वक्रोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते ।
यत्नोऽस्यां कविना कार्यः कोऽलङ्कारोऽनया विना' इति ॥

वक्रोक्तिरेव सर्वेषामलङ्काराणां मूलमिति यन्मतं भामहः पूर्वं स्थिरीकृतवान्, तस्यैव प्रकारान्तरमाश्रितो भूयान् प्रपञ्चः वक्रोक्तिजीवितकारस्य कुन्तकाचार्यस्य ग्रन्थे समुपलभ्यते । सर्वं एवालङ्कारिका भामहीयमतमनुसृत्य अलङ्कारेषु वक्रोक्तेः–अतिशयोक्तेः––प्राणदातृत्वं स्वीकुर्वन्त्येव । चतुर्थे दशविधानां

दोषाणां विद्यते विशदा विवेचना । पञ्चमे च न्यायविरोधिदोषस्य परिहार्यत्वप्रसङ्गे बहून् तर्कविषयान् विशदतया भामहः समुदलिखत् । अयमेव न्यायनिर्णयात्मकः परिच्छेदो बौद्धाचार्यदिङ्नागस्य सिद्धान्तेन संवादं भजते इति पूर्वमेवाद्घोषितमस्माभिः । षष्ठे च परिच्छेदे शब्दशुद्धिनिबन्धना कापि प्रयोगपद्धतिः परिशोधिता सम्यग्विवेचिता च विद्यते । अत्रत्यं विषयं सूक्ष्मेक्षिकया समीक्षमाणा वयं स्फुटमिदं तर्कयामो यत् न्यायालङ्कारयोरिव व्याकरणेऽपि भामहस्य जृम्भते स्म कश्चन प्रकृष्टपाण्डित्यपटिमा यदभिभूता न्यासकारसदृशा अनेके महान्तोऽपि वैयाकरणा खर्वितगर्वमिवात्मानं नूनमेव कल्पयन्ति स्म । ग्रन्थेऽस्मिन् समस्ता उदाहरणश्लोका भामहनिर्मिता एवेति काव्यरचनायामपि भामहस्य चातुरी चमत्करोति काव्यमर्मज्ञान् । काव्यालङ्कारे भाषायाः प्राञ्जलता, शब्दानां मनोरमसन्निवेशः, रीतिः सहजा सरलता, आलोचनायाश्च कोऽप्यभिनवो विशदः क्रमः-सर्वमेतत् केषां सुमनसामामोदाय न भवेदिति ।

अस्मदीयप्रयत्नोऽयं काव्यालङ्कारसंस्कृतौ ।
आचार्यभामहस्यास्तां प्रीतये तुष्टितो विदाम् ॥

अथ विषयानुक्रमः ।

षष्ट्या शरीरं निर्णीतं शतषष्ट्या त्वलङ्कृतिः ।
पञ्चाशता दोषदृष्टिः सप्तत्या न्यायनिर्णयः ॥
षष्ट्या शब्दस्य शुद्धिः स्यादित्येवं वस्तुपञ्चकम् ।
उक्तं षड्भिः परिच्छेदैर्भामहेन क्रमेण वः ॥

भामहालङ्कारः ।

श्रीगणेशाय नमः ।

प्रणम्य सार्वं सर्वज्ञं मनोवाक्कायकर्मभिः ।
काव्यालङ्कार इत्येष यथाबुद्धि विधास्यते ॥ १ ॥
धर्मार्थकाममोक्षेषु वैचक्षण्यं कलासु च ।
प्रीतिं करोति कीर्त्तिं च साधुकाव्यनिबन्धनम् ॥२॥
अधनस्येव दातृत्वं क्लीबस्येवास्त्रकौशलम् ।
अज्ञस्येव प्रगल्भत्वमकवेः शास्त्रवेदनम् ॥ ३ ॥
विनयेन विना का श्रीः का निशा शशिना विना ।
रहिता सत्कवित्वेन कीदृशी वाग्विदग्धता ॥ ४ ॥
गुरूपदेशादध्येतुं शास्त्रं जडधियोऽप्यलम् ।
काव्यं तु जायते जातु कस्यचित् प्रतिभावतः ॥५॥
उपेयुषामपि दिवं सन्निबन्धविधायिनाम् ।
आस्त एव निरातङ्कं कान्तं काव्यमयं वपुः ॥ ६ ॥
रुणद्धि रोदसी चास्य यावत् कीर्त्तिरनश्वरी ॥
तावत् किलाऽयमध्यास्ते सुकृती वैबुधं पदम् ॥७॥
अतोऽभिवाञ्छता कीर्त्तिं स्थेयसीमाभुवः स्थितेः ।
यत्नो विदितवेद्येन विधेयः काव्यलक्षणः ॥८॥

शब्दश्छन्दोऽभिधानार्था इतिहासाश्रयाः कथाः ।
लोको युक्तिः कलाश्चेति मन्तव्याः काव्यैर्वशी ॥
(काव्ययैरमी?) ॥९॥

शब्दाऽभिधेये विज्ञाय कृत्वा तद्विदुपासनाम् ।
विलोक्याऽन्यनिबन्धांश्च कार्यः काव्यक्रियादरः ॥१०॥

सर्वथा पदमप्येकं न निगाद्यमवद्यवत् ।
विलक्ष्मणा हि काव्येन दुस्सुतेनेव निन्द्यते ॥११॥

अकवित्वमधर्माय व्याधये दण्डनाय वा ।
कुकवित्वं पुनः साक्षान्मृतिमाहुर्मनीषिणः ॥१२॥

रूपकादिरलङ्कारस्तस्यान्यैर्बहुधोदितः ।
न कान्तमपि निर्भूषं विभाति वनितामुखम् ॥१३॥

रूपकादिमलङ्कारं बाह्यमाचक्षते परे ।
सुपां तिङां च व्युत्पत्तिं वाचां वाञ्छन्त्यलङ्कृतिम् १४

तदेतदाहुः सौशब्द्यं नाऽर्थव्युत्पत्तिरीदृशी ।
शब्दाभिधेयालङ्कारभेदादिष्टं द्वयं तु नः ॥ १५ ॥

शब्दार्थौ सहितौ काव्यं गद्यं पद्यञ्च तद्द्विधा ।
संस्कृतं प्राकृतं चान्यदपभ्रंश इति त्रिधा ॥१६॥

वृत्तदेवादिचरितशंसि चोत्पाद्यवस्तु च ।
कलाशास्त्राश्रयञ्चेति चतुर्धा भिद्यते पुनः ॥१७॥

---

१ काव्ययैर्ह्यमी-ग । २ कयुतं ? (संस्कृत?)-ग ।

सर्गबन्धोऽभिनेयार्थं तथैवाख्यायिकाकथे ।
अनिबद्धञ्च काव्यादि तत्पुनः पञ्चधोच्यते ॥१८॥
सर्गबन्धो महाकाव्यं महताञ्च महच्च यत् ।
अग्राम्यशब्दमर्थ्यञ्च सालङ्कारं सदाश्रयम् ॥ १९ ॥
मन्त्रै[1]दूतप्रयाणाजिनायकाभ्युदयैश्च यत् ।
पञ्चभिः सन्धिभिर्युक्तं नातिव्याख्येयमृद्धिमत् ॥ २० ॥
चतुर्वर्गाभिधानेऽपि भूयसार्थोपदेशकृत ।
युक्तं लोकस्वभावेन रसैश्च सकलैः पृथक् ॥ २१ ॥
नायकं प्रागुपन्यस्य वंशवीर्यश्रुतादिभिः ।
न तस्यैव वधं ब्रूयादन्योत्कर्षाभिधित्सया ॥ २२ ॥
यदि काव्यशरीरस्य न स व्यापितयेष्यते ।
न चाभ्युदयभाक्तस्य मुधादौ ग्रहणस्तवौ[2] ॥ २३ ॥
[3]नाटकं द्विपदीशम्यारासकस्कन्धकादि यत् ।
उक्तं तदभिनेयार्थमुक्तोऽन्यैस्तस्य विस्तरः ॥ २४ ॥
प्रकृतां[4]नाकुलश्रव्यशब्दार्थपदवृत्तिना ।
गद्येन युक्तोदात्तार्था सोच्छ्वासाख्यायिका मता ॥२५॥
वृत्तमाख्यायते तस्यां नायकेन स्वचेष्टितम्[5] ।
वक्त्रं चापरवक्त्रञ्च काले भाव्यार्थशंसि च ॥ २६ ॥

---

१ मन्त्रि-क । २ ग्रहणं स्तवे-ग । ३ नारकं-घ ।
४ प्रसृता-ख, प्रकृता (सृता)-घ । ५ स्वचेष्टितम्-घ ।

कवेरभिप्रायकृतैः कथ[1]नैः कैश्चिदङ्किता ।
कन्याहरणसङ्ग्रामविप्रलम्भोदयान्विता ॥ २७ ॥
न वक्त्रापरवक्त्राभ्यां युक्ता नोच्छ्वासवत्यपि ।
संस्कृतं संस्कृता चेष्टा कथापभ्रंशभाक्तथा[2] ॥ २८ ॥
अन्यैः स्वचरितं तस्यां नायकेन तु नोच्यते ।
स्वगुणाविष्कृतिं कुर्यादभिजातः कथं जनः ॥ २९ ॥
अनिबद्धं पुनर्गाथाश्लोकमात्रादि तत्पुनः ।
युक्तं वक्रस्वभावोक्त्या सर्वमेवैतदिष्यते ॥ ३० ॥
वैद[3]र्भमन्यदस्तीति मन्यन्ते सुधियोऽपरे ।
तदेव च किल ज्यायः सदर्थमपि नापरम् ॥ ३१ ॥
गौडीयमिदमेतत्तु वैदर्भमिति किं पृथक् ।
गतानुगतिकन्यायान्नानाख्येयममेधसाम् ॥ ३२ ॥
ननु चाश्मक[4]वंशादि वैदर्भमिति कथ्यते ।
कामं तथास्तु प्रायेण संज्ञेच्छातो विधीयते ॥ ३३ ॥
अपुष्टार्थमवक्रोक्ति प्रसन्नमृजु कोमलम् ।
भिन्नं गेयमिवेदं तु केवलं श्रुतिपेशलम् ॥ ३४ ॥
अलङ्कारवदग्राम्यमर्थ्यं न्याय्यमनाकुलम् ।
गौडीयमपि साधीयो वैदर्भमिति नान्यथा ॥ ३५ ॥

---

१ कथा (थ?) नैः-ग । २ तदा—क ।
३ वेदर्भ-ग । ४ चास्मक-ग ।

न नितान्तादिमात्रेण जायते चारुता गिराम् ।
वक्राऽभिधेयशब्दोक्तिरिष्टा वाचामलङ्कृतिः ॥ ३६ ॥
नेयार्थं क्लिष्टमन्यार्थमवाचकमयुक्तिमत् ।
गूढशब्दाभिधानञ्च कवयो न प्रयुञ्जते ॥ ३७ ॥
नेयार्थं नीयते युक्तो यस्यार्थः कृतिभिर्बलात् ।
शब्दन्यायानुपारूढः कथञ्चित् स्वाभिसन्धिना ॥ ३८ ॥
मायेव भद्रेति यथा सा चाऽसाध्वी प्रकल्पना ।
वेणुदाकेरिति च तान्नियन्ति वचनाद्विना ॥ ३९ ॥
क्लिष्टं व्यवहितं विद्यादन्यार्थविगमे यथा[1] ।
विजहुस्तस्य ताः शोकं क्रीडायां विकृतञ्च तत् ॥४०॥
हिमापहामित्रधरैर्व्याप्तं व्योमेत्यवाचकम् ।
साक्षादरूढं वाच्येऽर्थे नाभिधानं प्रतीयते ॥ ४१ ॥
अयुक्तिमद्यथा दूता जलभृन्मारुतेन्दवः[2] ।
तथा भ्रमरहारीतचक्रवाकशुकादयः ॥ ४२ ॥
अवाचोऽव्यक्तवाचश्च दूरदेशविचारिणः ।
कथं दूत्यं प्रपद्येरन्निति युक्त्या न युज्यते ॥४३॥
यदि चोत्कण्ठया यत्तदुन्मत्त इव भाषते ।
तथा भवतु भूम्नेदं सुमेधोभिः प्रयुज्यते ॥ ४४ ॥

---

१ (दन्यार्थं विगमे यथा ?)–ग ।
२ जलभृन्मात्रकेऽङ्च ? (मारुतेन्दवः?) ग, जलभृन्मात्र (रु ?) तेषु च–क ।

गूढशब्दाभिधानञ्च न प्रयोज्यं कथञ्चन ।
सुधियामपि नैवेदमुपकाराय कल्पते ॥ ४५ ॥
असितर्त्तितुगाद्रिच्छित् स्वःक्षितां पतिरद्धिदृक् ।
अमिद्भिः शुभ्रदग्दष्टैर्द्विषो जेघ्नीयिषीष्ट वेः[1] ॥ ४६ ॥
श्रुतिदुष्टार्थदुष्टे च कल्पनादुष्टमित्यपि ।
श्रुतिकष्टं तथैवाहुर्वाचां दोषं चतुर्विधम् ॥ ४७ ॥
विड्वर्चोविष्ठितक्लिन्न[2]च्छिन्नवान्तप्रवृत्तयः ।
प्रचारधर्षितोद्गारविसर्गहृदयन्त्रिताः[3] ॥ ४८ ॥
हिरण्यरेताः सम्बाधः पेलवोपस्थिताण्डजाः ।
वाक्काटवादयश्चेति श्रुतिदुष्टा मता गिरः ॥ ४९ ॥
अर्थदुष्टं पुनर्ज्ञेयं यत्रोक्ते जायते मतिः ।
असभ्यवस्तुविषया शब्दैस्तद्वाचिभिर्यथा ॥५०॥
हन्तुमेव प्रवृत्तस्य स्तब्धस्य[4] विवरैषिणः ।
पतनं जायतेऽवश्यं कृच्छ्रेण पुनरुन्नतिः ॥ ५१ ॥
पदद्वयस्य सन्धाने यदनिष्टं प्रकल्पते[5] ।
तदाहुः कल्पनादुष्टं सशौर्याभरणो यथा ॥ ५२ ॥

---

१ असितर्तिभुगाद्रिक्षित् स्वः कितां पतिरद्धिदृक् ।
अमीभिः शुभ्रदग्वृष्टैर्द्विषो जेघ्नीयिषीष्ट वः ॥—घ ।
२ ०छिन्नक्लिन्न०-क । ३ हृदयं तृताः ? (यन्त्रिताः ?)-ग ।
४ स्तम्भस्य (स्तब्धस्य ?)-ग ।
५ प्रगल्भते-क, प्रकल्प्यते-घ ।

यथाऽजिह्लददित्यादि श्रुतिकष्टञ्च तद्विदुः।
न तदिच्छन्ति कृतिनो गण्डमप्यपरे किल॥ ५३ ॥
सन्निवेशविशेषात्तु दुरुक्तमपि शोभते।
नीलं पलाशमाबद्धमन्तराले स्रजामिव॥ ५४ ॥
किञ्चिदाश्रयसौन्दर्याद् धत्ते शोभामसाध्वपि।
कान्ताविलोचनन्यस्तं मलीमसमिवाञ्जनम्॥ ५५ ॥
आपाण्डुगण्डमेतत्ते वदनं वनजेक्षणे।
सङ्गमात्पाण्डुशब्दस्य गण्डः साधु यथोदितम्॥५६॥
अनयाऽन्यदपि ज्ञेयं दिशा युक्तमसाध्वपि।
यथा विक्लिन्नगण्डानां करिणां मदवारिभिः[1]॥५७॥
मदक्लिन्नकपोलानां द्विरदानां चतुश्शती।
यथा तद्वदसाधीयः साधीयश्च प्रयोजयेत्॥ ५८ ॥
एतद् ग्राह्यं सुरभि कुसुमं ग्राम्यमेतन्निधेयं
धत्ते शोभां विरचितमिदं स्थानमस्यैतदस्य।
मालाकारो रचयति यथा साधु विज्ञाय मालां
योज्यं काव्येष्ववहितधिया तद्वदेवाऽभिधानम्॥५९॥

इति श्रीभामहालङ्कारे प्रथमः परिच्छेदः।

१ मुदवारिभिः-घ।

द्वितीयः परिच्छेदः ।

माधुर्यमभिवाञ्छन्तः प्रसादं च सुमेधसः ।
समासवन्ति भूयांसि न पदानि प्रयुञ्जते ॥ १ ॥
केचिदोजोऽभिधित्सन्तः समस्यन्ति बहून्यपि ।
यथा मन्दारकुसुमरेणुपिञ्जरितालका ॥ २ ॥
श्रव्यं नातिसमस्तार्थं काव्यं मधुरमिष्यते ।
आविद्वदङ्गनाबालप्रतीतार्थं प्रसादवत् ॥ ३ ॥
अनुप्रासः सयमको रूपकं दीपकोपमे ।
इति वाचामलङ्काराः पञ्चैवाऽन्यैरुदाहृताः ॥ ४ ॥
सरूपवर्णविन्यासमनुप्रासं प्रचक्षते ।
किंतया चिन्तया कान्ते नितान्तेति यथोदितम् ॥५॥
ग्राम्यानुप्रासमन्यत्तु मन्यन्ते सुधियोऽपरे ।
स लोलमालानीलालिकुलाकुलगलो बलः ॥ ६ ॥
नानार्थवन्तोऽनुप्रासा न चाप्यसदृशाक्षराः ।
युक्त्यानया मध्यमया जायन्ते चारवो गिरः ॥ ७ ॥
लाटीयमप्यनुप्रासमिहेच्छन्त्यपरे यथा ।
दृष्टिं दृष्टिसुखां धेहि चन्द्रश्चन्द्रमुखोदितः ॥ ८ ॥
आदिमध्यान्तयमकं पादाभ्यासं तथावली ।
समस्तपादयमकमित्येतत् पञ्चधोच्यते ॥ ९ ॥

सन्दष्टकसमुद्गादेरत्रैवान्तर्गतिर्मता ।
आदौ मध्यान्तयोर्वा स्यादिति पञ्चैव तद्यथा ॥१०॥
साऽधुना साधुना तेन राजताऽराजताऽऽभृता ।
सहितं सहितं कर्त्तुं सङ्गतं सङ्गतं जनम् ॥ ११ ॥
साधुः संसाराद्बिभ्यदस्मादसारात्
कृत्वा क्लेशान्तं याति वर्त्म प्रशान्तम् ।
जातिं व्याधीनां दुर्नयानामधीनां
वाञ्छन्त्या (ञ्ज्या?)यस्त्वं छिन्धि मुक्तान(म?)यस्त्वम्॥१२॥
न ते धीर्धीर भोगेषु रमणीयेषु सङ्गता
मुनीनपि हरन्त्येते रमणी येषु सङ्गता ॥ १३ ॥
सितासिताक्षीं सुपयोधराधरां
सुसम्मदां व्यक्तमदां ललामदाम् ।
घना घना नीलघनाघनालकां
प्रियामिमामुत्सुकयन्ति यन्ति च ॥ १४ ॥
अमी नृपा दत्तसमग्रशासनाः
कदाचिदप्यप्रतिबद्धशासनाः ।
कृतागसां मार्गभिदां च शासनाः
पितृक्रमाध्यासितताद्दशासनाः ॥ १५ ॥
अनन्तरैकान्तरयोरेवं पादान्तयोरपि ।

---

१ स्यामि (दि ?) ति–ग २ दुर्दयानां–ग

कृत्स्नं च सर्वपादेषु दुष्कृतं साधु तादृशम् ॥ १६ ॥
तुल्यश्रुतीनां भिन्नानामभिधेयैः परस्परम् ।
वर्णानां यः पुनर्वादो यमकं तन्निगद्यते ॥ १७ ॥
प्रतीतशब्दमोजस्वि सुश्लिष्टपदसन्धि च ।
प्रसादि स्वभिधानंच यमकं कृतिनां मतम् ॥ १८ ॥
नानाधात्वर्थगम्भीरा यमकव्यपदेशिनी ।
प्रहेलिका सा ह्युदिता रामशर्माच्युतोत्तरे ॥ १९ ॥
काव्यान्यपि यदीमानि व्याख्यागम्यानि शास्त्रवत् ।
उत्सवः सुधियामेव हन्त ! दुर्मेधसो हताः ॥ २० ॥
उपमानेन यत्तत्त्वमुपमेयस्य रूप्यते ।
गुणानां समतां दृष्ट्वा रूपकं नाम तद्विदुः ॥ २१ ॥
समस्तवस्तुविषयमेकदेशविवर्त्ति च ।
द्विधा रूपकमुद्दिष्टमेतत्तच्चोच्यते यथा ॥ २२ ॥
शीकर[1]ाम्भोमदसृजस्तुङ्गा जलददन्तिनः ।
निर्यान्तो मण्डयन्तीमे शक्रकार्मुककाननम्[2] ॥ २३ ॥
तडिद्वलयकक्ष्याणां बलाकामालभारिणाम् ।
पयोमुचां ध्वनिर्धीरो दुनोति मम तां प्रियाम् ॥२४॥
आदिमध्यान्तविषयं त्रिधा दीपकमिष्यते ।

---

१ सीकर०—ग २ निर्यान्तो मदयन्तीमे शक्रकार्मुककारणम्-ग

एकस्यैव त्र्यवस्थत्वादिति तद्भिद्यते त्रिधा ॥ २५ ॥
अमूनि कुर्वतेऽन्वर्थामस्याख्यामर्थदीपनात् ।
त्रिभिर्निदर्शनैश्चेदं त्रिधा निर्दिश्यते यथा ॥ २६ ॥
मदो जनयति प्रीतिं साऽनङ्गं मानभङ्गुरम् ।
स प्रियासङ्गमोत्कण्ठां साऽसह्यां मनसश्शुचम् ॥२७॥
मालिनीरंशुकभृतः स्त्रियोऽलङ्कुरुते मधुः ।
हारीतशुकवाचश्च भूधराणामुपत्यकाः ॥ २८ ॥
चीरीमतीररण्यानीः[2] सरितश्शुष्यदम्भसः ।
प्रवासिनां च चेतांसि शुचिरन्तं निनीषति ॥ २९ ॥
विरुद्धेनोपमानेन देशकालक्रियादिभिः ।
उपमेयस्य यत्साम्यं गुणलेशेन सोपमा ॥ ३० ॥
यथेवशब्दौ सादृश्यमाहतुर्व्यतिरेकिणोः ।
दूर्वाकाण्डमिव श्यामं[3] तन्वी श्यामालता[4] यथा ॥३१॥
विना यथेवशब्दाभ्यां समासाभिहिता परा ।
यथा कमलपत्राक्षी शशाङ्कवदनेति च ॥ ३२ ॥
वतिनापि क्रियासाम्यं तद्वदेवाभिधीयते ।
द्विजातिवदधीतेऽसौ गुरुवच्चानुशास्ति नः ॥ ३३ ॥
समानवस्तुन्यासेन प्रतिवस्तूपमोच्यते ।
यथेवानभिधानेऽपि गुणसाम्यप्रतीतितः ॥ ३४ ॥

---

१ सानलां—क २ चरीमती-क ३ श्यामा—घ ४ श्यामलता-ग, घ

साधु साधारणत्वादिर्गुणोऽत्र व्यतिरिच्यते ।
स साम्यमापादयति विरोधेऽपि तयोर्यथा ॥ ३५ ॥
कियन्तः सन्ति गुणिनः साधुसाधारणश्रियः ।
स्वादुपाकफलानम्राः कियन्तो वाऽध्वशाखिनः॥३६॥
यदुक्तं त्रिप्रकारत्वं तस्याः कैश्चिन्महात्मभिः ।
निन्दाप्रशंसाचिख्यासाभेदादत्राभिधीयते ॥ ३७ ॥
सामान्यगुणनिर्देशात् त्रयमप्युदितं ननु ।
मालोपमादिः सर्वोऽपि न ज्यायान् विस्तरो मुधा॥३८॥
हीनतासम्भवो लिङ्गवचोभेदो विपर्ययः ।
उपमानाधिकत्वं च तेनासदृशतापि च ॥ ३९ ॥
त एत उपमादोषाः सप्त मेधाविनोदिताः ।
सोदाहरणलक्ष्माणो वर्ण्यन्तेऽत्र च ते पृथक्॥ ४० ॥

स मारुताकम्पितपीतवासा
बिभ्रत् सलीलं शशिभासमब्जम् ।
यदुप्रवीरः प्रगृहीतशार्ङ्गः
सेन्द्रायुधो मेघ इवावभासे ॥ ४१ ॥

शक्रचापग्रहादत्र दर्शितं किल कार्मुकम् ।
वासश्शङ्खानुपादानाद्धीनमित्यभिधीयते ॥ ४२ ॥
सर्वं सर्वेण सारूप्यं नास्ति भावस्य कस्यचित् ।
यथोपपत्ति कृतिभिरुपमासु प्रयुज्यते ॥ ४३ ॥

अखण्डमण्डलः क्वेन्दुः क्व कान्ताननमद्युति ।
यत्किञ्चित् कान्तिसामान्याच्छशिनैवोपमीयते॥ ४४॥
किञ्चित्काव्यानि नेयानि लक्षणेन महात्मनाम् ।
दृष्टं वा सर्व्वसारूप्यं राजमित्रे यथोदितम् ॥ ४५ ॥

सूर्यांशुसम्मीलितलोचनेषु
दीनेषु पद्मानिलनिर्मदेषु ।
साध्व्यः स्वगेहेष्विव भर्तृहीनाः
केका विनेशुः शिखिनां मुखेषु ॥ ४६ ॥
निष्पेतुरास्यादिव तस्य दीप्ताः
शरा धनुर्मण्डलमध्यभाजः ।
जाज्वल्यमाना इव वारिधारा
दिनार्द्धभाजः परिवेषिणोऽर्कात् ॥ ४७ ॥

शाखवर्धनस्य ।

कथं पातोऽम्बुधाराणां ज्वलन्तीनां विवस्वतः ।
असम्भवादयं युक्त्या तेनासम्भव उच्यते ॥ ४८ ॥
तत्रासम्भविनार्थेन कः कुर्यादुपमां कृती ।
को नाम वह्निनौपम्यं कुर्वीत शशलक्ष्मणः ॥ ४९ ॥
यस्यातिशयवानर्थः कथं सोऽसम्भवो मतः ।
इष्टं चातिशयार्थत्वमुपमोत्प्रेक्षयोर्यथा ॥ ५० ॥

---

१ विनेदुः—क

पुञ्जीभूतमिव ध्वान्तमेष भाति मतङ्गजः ।
सरः शरत्प्रसन्नाम्भो नभःखण्डमिवोज्झितम् ॥५१॥
अथ लिङ्गवचोभेदावुच्येते सविपर्ययौ ।
हीनाधिकत्वात् स द्वेधा त्रयमप्युच्यते यथा ॥५२॥
अविगाह्योऽसि नारीणामनन्यमनसामपि ।
विषमोपलभिन्नोर्मिरापगेवोत्तितीर्षतः ॥ ५३ ॥
क्वचिदग्रे प्रसरता क्वचिदापत्य निम्नता ।
शुनेव सारङ्गकुलं त्वया भिन्नं द्विषां बलम् ॥५४॥
अयं पद्मासनासीनश्चक्रवाको विराजते ।
युगादौ भगवान् ब्रह्मा विनिर्मित्सुरिव प्रजाः ॥५५॥
ननूपमीयते पाणिः कमलेन विकासिना ।
अधरो विद्रुमच्छेदभासा बिम्बफलेन च ॥ ५६ ॥
उच्यते काममस्तीदं किन्तु स्त्रीपुंसयोरयम् ।
विधिर्नाभिमतोऽन्यैस्तु त्रयाणामपि नेष्यते ॥५७॥
स पीतवासाः प्रगृहीतशार्ङ्गो मनोज्ञभीमं वपुराप कृष्णः ।
शतह्रदेन्द्रायुधवान्निशायां संसृज्यमानश्शशिनेव मेघः॥५८॥
रामशर्मणः ।

शशिनो ग्रहणादेतदाधिक्यं किल नह्ययम् ।
निर्दिष्ट उपमेयेऽर्थे वाच्यो वा जलदोऽत्र तु ॥ ५९ ॥
न सर्वसारूप्यमिति विस्तरेणोदितो विधिः ।

अभिप्रायात्कवेर्नात्र विधेया जलजे मतिः ॥६०॥
आधिक्यमुपमानानां न्याय्यं[1] नाधिकता भवेत् ।
गोक्षीरकुन्दहालिनां विशुद्ध्या सदृशं यशः ॥ ६१ ॥
एकेनैवो[2]पमानेन ननु सादृश्यमुच्यते ।
उक्तार्थस्य प्रयोगो हि गुरुमर्थं न पुष्यति ॥६२॥
वनेऽथ तस्मिन्वनितानुयायिनः
प्रवृत्तदानार्द्रकटा मतंगजाः ।
विचित्रबर्हाभरणाश्च बर्हिणो
बभुर्दिवीवामलविग्रहा ग्रहाः ॥ ६३ ॥
ग्रहैरपि गजादीनां यदि सादृश्यमुच्यते ।
तथापि तेषां तैरस्ति कान्तिर्वाप्युग्रतापि वा ॥६४॥
इत्युक्त उपमाभेदो वक्ष्यते चापरः पुनः ।
उपमादेरलङ्कारा‌द्विशेषोऽन्योऽभिधीयते ॥ ६५ ॥
आक्षेपोऽर्थान्तरन्यासो व्यतिरेको विभावना ।
समासातिशयोक्ती च षडलङ्कृतयोऽपराः ॥६६॥
वक्ष्यमाणोक्तविषयस्तत्राक्षेपो द्विधा मतः ।
एकरूपतया शेषा निर्देक्ष्यन्ते यथाक्रमम् ॥ ६७ ॥
प्रतिषेध इवेष्टस्य यो विशेषाभिधित्सया ।
आक्षेप इति तं सन्तः शंसन्ति द्विविधं यथा ॥६८॥

---

१ न्याय्या-घ। २ एतेनै०-ग।

अहं त्वां यदि नेक्षेय क्षणमप्युत्सुका ततः ।
इयदेवास्त्वतोऽन्येन किमुक्तेनाप्रियेण तु ॥ ६९ ॥
त्वत्विक्रमान्तभुवश्चित्रं यन्न तवोद्धतिः ।
को वा सेतुरलं सिन्धोर्विकारकरणं प्रति ॥ ७० ॥
उपन्यसनमन्यस्य यदर्थस्योदितादृते ।
ज्ञेयः सोऽर्थान्तरन्यासः पूर्वार्थानुगतो यथा ॥७१॥
परानीकानि भीमानि विविक्षोर्न तव व्यथा ।
साधु वाऽसाधु वाऽऽगामि पुंसामात्मैव शंसति ॥७२॥
हिशब्देनापि हेत्वर्थप्रथनादुक्तसिद्धये ।
अयमर्थान्तरन्यासः सुतरां व्यज्यते यथा ॥ ७३ ॥
वहन्ति गिरयो मेघानभ्युपेतान् गुरूनपि ।
गरीयानेव हि गुरून् बिभर्ति प्रणयागतान् ॥७४॥
उपमानवतोऽर्थस्य यद्विशेषनिदर्शनम् ।
व्यतिरेकं तमिच्छन्ति विशेषापादनाद्यथा ॥ ७५ ॥
सितासिते पक्ष्मवती नेत्रे ते ताम्रराजिनी ।
एकान्तशुभ्रश्यामे तु पुण्डरीकासितोत्पले ॥ ७६ ॥
क्रियायाः प्रतिषेधे या तत्फलस्य विभावना ।
ज्ञेया विभावनैवासौ समाधौ सुलभे सति ॥ ७७ ॥
अपीतमत्ताः शिखिनो दिशोऽनुत्कण्ठिताकुलाः ।

---

१ त्वा-ग ।

नीपोऽविलिप्तसुरभिरभ्रष्टकलुषं जलम् ॥ ७८ ॥
यत्रोक्ते गम्यतेऽन्योऽर्थस्तत्समानविशेषणः ।
सा समासोक्तिरुद्दिष्टा संक्षिप्तार्थतया यथा[1] ॥७९॥
स्कन्धवानृजुरव्यालः स्थिरोऽनेक[2]महाफलः ।
जातस्तरुरयं चोच्चैः पातितश्च नभस्वता ॥८०॥
निमित्ततो वचो यत्तु लोकातिक्रान्तगोचरम् ।
मन्यन्तेऽतिशयोक्तिं तामलङ्कारतया यथा ॥८१॥
स्वपुष्पच्छविहारिण्या चन्द्रभासा तिरोहिताः ।
अन्वमीयन्त भृङ्गालिवाचा सप्तच्छदद्रुमाः ॥८२॥
अपां यदि त्वक् शिथिला च्युता स्यात् फणिनामिव ।
तदा शुक्लांशुकानि स्युरङ्गेष्वम्भसि योषिताम् ॥८३॥
इत्येवमादिरुदिता गुणातिशययोगतः ।
सर्वैवातिशयोक्तिस्तु तर्कयेत् तां यथागमम् ॥८४॥
सैषा सर्वैव वक्रोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते ।
यत्नोऽस्यां कविना कार्यः कोऽलङ्कारोऽनया विना ॥८५॥
हेतुश्च सूक्ष्मो लेशोऽथ नालङ्कारतया मतः ।
समुदायाऽभिधानस्य वक्रोक्त्यनभिधानतः ॥ ८६ ॥
गतोऽस्तमर्को भातीन्दुर्यान्ति वासाय पक्षिणः ।
इत्येवमादि किं काव्यं वार्त्तामेनां प्रचक्षते ॥८७॥

१. संक्षिप्तार्था यथा तथा-क । २. स्थिरोऽङ्क-घ ।

यथासङ्ख्यमथोत्प्रेक्षामलङ्कारद्वयं विदुः ।
सङ्ख्यानमिति मेधाविनोत्प्रेक्षाभिहिता क्वचित् ॥८८॥
भूयसामुपदिष्टानामर्थानामसधर्मणाम् ।
क्रमशो योऽनुनिर्देशो यथासङ्ख्यं तदुच्यते ॥८९॥
पद्मेन्दुभृङ्गमातङ्गपुंस्कोकिलकलापिनः ।
वक्त्रकान्तीक्षणगतिवाणीबालैस्त्वया जिताः ॥९०॥
अविवक्षितसामान्या किञ्चिच्चोपमया सह ।
अतद्गुणक्रियायोगादुत्प्रेक्षातिशयान्विता ॥ ९१ ॥
किंशुकव्यपदेशेन तरुमारुह्य सर्वतः ।
दग्धाऽदग्धमरण्यान्याः पश्यतीव विभावसुः ॥९२॥
स्वभावोक्तिरलङ्कार इति केचित् प्रचक्षते ।
अर्थस्य तदवस्थत्वं स्वभावोऽभिहितो यथा ॥९३॥
आक्रोशन्नाह्वयन्नन्यानाधावन्मण्डलैर्नुदन् ।
गा वारयति दण्डेन डिम्भः शस्यावतारणीः ॥९४॥
समासेनोदितमिदं धीखेदायैव विस्तरः ।
असंगृहीतमप्यन्यदभ्यूह्यमनया दिशा ॥ ९५ ॥
स्वयंकृतैरेवनिदर्शनैरियं मया प्रक्लृप्ता खलु वागलङ्कृतिः ।
अतः परं चारुरनेकधापरो गिरामलङ्कारविधिर्विधास्यते॥९६॥

इति श्रीभामहालङ्कारे द्वितीयः परिच्छेदः ।

अथ तृतीयः परिच्छेदः ।

प्रेयो रसवदूर्जस्वि पर्यायोक्तं समाहितम् ।
द्विप्रकारमुदात्तं च भेदैः श्लिष्टमपि त्रिभिः ॥ १ ॥
अपह्नुतिं विशेषोक्तिं विशेषं तुल्ययोगिताम् ।
अप्रस्तुतप्रशसां च व्याजस्तुतिनिदर्शने ॥ २ ॥
उपमारूपकं चान्यदुपमेयोपमामपि ।
सहोक्तिपरिवृत्ती च ससन्देहमनन्वयम् ॥ ३ ॥
उत्प्रेक्षावयवं चान्ये संसृष्टमपि चापरे ।
भाविकत्वं च निजगुरलङ्कारं सुमेधसः ॥ ४ ॥
प्रेयो गृहागतं कृष्णमवादीद्विदुरो यथा ।
अद्य या मम गोविन्द जाता त्वयि गृहागते ।
कालेनैषा भवेत् प्रीतिस्तवैवागमनात् पुनः ॥ ५ ॥
रसवद् दर्शितस्पष्टशृङ्गारादिरसं यथा ।
देवी समागमद् धर्ममस्करण्यतिरोहिता ॥ ६ ॥
ऊर्जस्वि कर्णेन यथा पार्थाय पुनरागतः ।
द्विः सन्दधाति किं कर्णः शल्येत्यहिरपाकृतः ॥ ७ ॥
पर्यायोक्तं यदन्येन प्रकारेणाभिधीयते ।
उवाच रत्नाहरणे चैद्यं शार्ङ्गधनुर्यथा ॥ ८ ॥
गृहेष्वध्वसु वा नान्नं भुञ्ज्महे यदधीतिनः ।

न भुञ्जते । द्विजास्तच्च रसदाननिवृत्तये ॥ ९ ॥
समाहितं राजमित्रे यथा क्षत्रिययोषिताम् ।
रामप्रसक्त्यै यान्तीनां पुरोऽदृश्यत नारदः ॥१०॥
उदात्त[1]शक्तिमान् रामो गुरुवाक्यानुरोधकः ।
विहायो[2]पनतं राज्यं यथा वनमुपागमत् ॥ ११ ॥
एतदेवापरेऽन्येन व्याख्यानेनान्यथा विदुः ।
नानारत्नादियुक्तं यत्तत् किलोदात्तमुच्यते ॥१२॥
चाणक्यो नक्तमुपयान्नन्दक्रीडागृहं यथा ।
शशिकान्तोपलच्छन्नं विवेद पयसां ग(क ?)णैः ॥१३॥
उपमानेन यत्तत्त्वमुपमेयस्य साध्यते ।
गुणक्रियाभ्यां नाम्ना च श्लिष्टं तदभिधीयते ॥ १४ ॥
लक्षणं रूपकेऽपीदं लक्ष्यते काममत्र तु ।
इष्टः प्रयोगो युगपदुपमानोपमेययोः ॥१५॥
शीकराम्भोमदसृजस्तुङ्गा जलददन्तिनः ।
इत्यत्र मेघकरिणां निर्देशः क्रियते समम् ॥१६॥
श्लेषादेवार्थवचसोरस्य च क्रियते भिदा ।
तत्सहोक्त्युपमाहेतुनि[3]र्देशात् क्रमशो यथा ॥ १७ ॥
छायावन्तो गतव्यालाः स्वारोहाः फलदायिनः ।

---

१. उदात्तं-ग । २. पवनं-ग ।
३ हेतुर्निर्देशा-घ ।

मार्गद्रुमा महान्तश्च परेषामेव भूतये ॥ १८ ॥
उन्नतालोकदयिता महान्तः प्राज्यवर्षिणः ॥
शमयन्ति क्षितेस्तापं सुराजानो घना इव ॥ १९ ॥
रत्नवत्त्वादगाधत्वात् स्वमर्यादाविलङ्घनात् ।
बहुसत्त्वाश्रयत्वाच्च सदृशत्वमुदन्वता ॥ २० ॥
अपह्नुतिरभीष्टा च किञ्चिदन्तर्गतोपमा ।
भूतार्थापह्नवादस्याः क्रियते चाभिधा यथा ॥ २१ ॥
नेयं विरौति भृङ्गाली मदेन मुखरा मुहुः ।
अयमाकृष्यमाणस्य[1] कन्दर्पधनुषो ध्वनिः ॥ २२ ॥
एकदेशस्य विगमे या गुणान्तरसंस्थितिः ।
विशेषप्रथनायासौ विशेषोक्तिर्मता यथा ॥ २३ ॥
स एकस्त्रीणि जयति जगन्ति कुसुमायुधः ।
हरतापि तनुं यस्य शम्भुना न हृतं बलम् ॥ २४ ॥
गुणस्य वा क्रियाया वा विरुद्धान्यक्रियाभिधा ।
या विशेषाभिधानाय विरोधं तं विदुर्बुधाः ॥२५॥
उपान्तरूढोपवनच्छायाशीतापि धूरसौ ।
विदूरदेशानपि वः सन्तापयति विद्विषः ॥ २६ ॥
न्यूनस्यापि विशिष्टेन गुणसाम्यविवक्षया ।
तुल्यकार्यक्रियायोगादित्युक्ता तुल्ययोगिता ॥ २७ ॥

---

१ आक्रन्दमाणस्य-ग ।

शेषो हिमगिरिस्त्वं च महान्तो गुरवः स्थिराः ।
यदलङ्घितमर्यादाश्चलन्तीं बिभृथ[1] क्षितिम् ॥२८॥
अधिकारादपेतस्य वस्तुनोऽन्यस्य या स्तुतिः ।
अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसेति सा चैवं कथ्यते यथा ॥ २९ ॥
प्रीणितप्रणयि स्वादु काले परिणतं बहु ।
विना पुरुषकारेण फलं पश्यत शाखिनाम् ॥ ३० ॥
दूराधिकगुणस्तोत्रव्यपदेशेन तुल्यताम् ।
किञ्चिद्विधित्सोर्या निन्दा व्याजस्तुतिरसौ यथा ॥३१॥
रामः सप्ताभिनत् सा(ता?)लान् गिरिं क्रौञ्चं भृगूत्तमः ।
शतांशेनापि भवता किं तयोः सदृशं कृतम् ॥३२॥
क्रिययैव विशिष्टस्य तदर्थस्योपदर्शनात् ।
ज्ञेया निदर्शना नाम यथेववतिभिर्विना ॥ ३३ ॥
अयं मन्दद्युतिर्भास्वानस्तं प्रति यियासति ।
उदयः पतनायेति श्रीमतो बोधयन्नरान् ॥ ३४ ॥
उपमानेन तद्भावमुपमेयस्य साधयत् ।
यां वदत्युपमामेतदुपमारूपकं यथा ॥ ३५ ॥
समग्रगगनायाममानदण्डो रथाङ्गिनः ।
पादो जयति सिद्धस्त्रीमुखेन्दुनवदर्पणः ॥३६॥
उपमानोपमेयत्वं यत्र पर्यायतो भवेत् ।

---

१ विभ्रति–क ।

उपमेयोपमां नाम ब्रुवते तां यथोदिताम् ॥३७॥
सुगन्धि नयनानन्दि मदिरामदपाटलम् ।
अम्भोजमिव वक्त्रं ते त्वदास्यमिव पङ्कजम् ॥३८॥
तुल्यकाले क्रिये यत्र वस्तुद्वयसमाश्रये ।
पदेनैकेन कथ्येते सहोक्तिः सा मता यथा ॥३९॥
हिमपाताविलदिशो गाढालिङ्गनहेतवः ।
वृद्धिमायान्ति यामिन्यः कामिनां प्रीतिभिः सह॥४०॥
विशिष्टस्य यदादानमन्यापोहेन वस्तुनः ।
अर्थान्तरन्यासवती परिवृत्तिरसौ यथा ॥ ४१ ॥
प्रदाय वित्तमर्थिभ्यः स यशोधनमादित ।
सतां विश्वजनीनानामिदमस्खलितं व्रतम् ॥ ४२ ॥
उपमानेन तत्त्वं च भेदं च वदतः पुनः ।
ससन्देहं वचः स्तुत्यै ससन्देहं विदुर्यथा ॥ ४३ ॥
किमयं शशी न स दिवा विराजते
कुसुमायुधो न धनुरस्य कौसुमम् ।
इति विस्मयाद्विमृशतोऽपि मे मति-
स्त्वयि वीक्षते न लभतेऽर्थनिश्चयम् ॥४४॥
यत्र तेनैव तस्य स्यादुपमानोपमेयता ।
असादृश्यविवक्षातस्तमित्याहुरनन्वयम् ॥ ४५ ॥
ताम्बूलरागवलयं स्फुरद्दशनदीधिति ।

इन्दीवराभनयनं तवेव वदनं तव ॥ ४६ ॥
श्लिष्टस्यार्थेन संयुक्तः किञ्चिदुत्प्रेक्षयान्वितः ।
रूपकार्थेन च पुनरुत्प्रेक्षावयवो यथा ॥ ४७ ॥
तुल्योदयावसानत्वाद गतेऽस्तं प्रति भास्वति ।
वासाय वासरः क्लान्तो विशतीव तमोगृहम् ॥४८॥
वरा विभूषा संसृष्टिर्बह्वलङ्कारयोगतः ।
रचिता रत्नमालेव सा चैवमुदिता यथा ॥ ४९ ॥
गाम्भीर्यलाघववतोर्युवयोः प्राज्यरत्नयोः ।
सुखसेव्यो जनानां त्वं दुष्टग्राहोऽम्भसां पतिः ॥५०॥
अनलङ्कृतकान्तं ते वदनं वनजद्युति ।
निशाकृतः[1] प्रकृत्यैव चारोः का वास्त्यलङ्कृतिः ॥५१॥
अन्येषामपि कर्त्तव्या संसृष्टिरनया दिशा ।
कियदुद्घाट्टितज्ञेभ्यः शक्यं कथयितुं मया ॥ ५२ ॥
भाविकत्वमिति प्राहुः प्रबन्धविषयं गुणम् ।
प्रत्यक्षा इव दृश्यन्ते यत्रार्था भूतभाविनः ॥५३॥
चित्रोदात्तादभुतार्थत्वं कथायाः स्वभिनीतता[2] ।
शब्दानाकुलता चेति तस्य हेतुं प्रचक्षते ॥५४॥
आशीरपि च केषाञ्चिदलङ्कारतया मता ।
सौहृदय्या(स्या?)विरोधोक्तौ प्रयोगोऽस्याश्च तद्यथा ॥५५॥

---

१ निशाकृतं–ग। २ स्वविनीतता–घ।

अस्मिन् जहीहि सुहृदि प्रणयाभ्यसूया-
माश्लिष्य गाढममुमानतमादरेण ।
विन्ध्यं महानिव घनः समयेऽभिवर्ष-
न्नानन्दजैर्नयनवारिभिरुक्षतु त्वाम् ॥ ५६ ॥

मदान्धमातङ्गविभिन्नसाला
हतप्रवीरा द्रुतभीतपौराः ।
त्वत्तेजसा दग्धसमस्तशोभा
द्विषां पुरः पश्यतु राजलोकः ॥ ५७ ॥

गिरामलङ्कारविधिः सविस्तरः
स्वयं विनिश्चित्य धिया मयोदितः ।
अनेन वागर्थविदामलङ्कृता
विभाति नारीव विदग्धमण्डना ॥ ५८ ॥

इति भामहालङ्कारे तृतीयः परिच्छेदः ॥

अथ चतुर्थः परिच्छेदः॥

अपार्थं व्यर्थमेकार्थं ससंशयमपक्रमम् ।
शब्दहीनं यतिभ्रष्टं भिन्नवृत्तं विसन्धि च ॥ १ ॥
देशकालकलालोकन्यायागमविरोधि च ।
प्रतिज्ञाहेतुदृष्टान्तहीनं दुष्टं च नेष्यते ॥ २ ॥
अपार्थमित्यपेतार्थं स चार्थः पदवाक्ययोः ।
अर्थवान् वर्णसंघातः सुप्तिङन्तं पदं पुनः ॥ ३ ॥
पदानामेव संघातः सापेक्षाणां परस्परम् ।
निराकाक्षं च तद्वाक्यमेकवस्तुनिबन्धनम् ॥ ४ ॥
क्रमवृत्तिषु वर्णेषु संघातादि न युज्यते ।
बुद्धौ तु सम्भवत्येतदन्यत्वेऽपि प्रतिक्षणम् ॥ ५ ॥
धीरन्त्यशब्दविषया वृत्तवर्णाहितस्मृतिः ।
वाक्यमित्याहुरपरे न शब्दाः क्षणनश्वराः ॥ ६ ॥
अत्रापि बहु वक्तव्यं जायते तत्तु नोदितम् ।
गुरुभिः किं विवादेन यथाप्रकृतमुच्यते ॥ ७ ॥
समुदायार्थशून्यं यत्तदपार्थकमिष्यते ।
दाडिमानि दशाऽपूपाः षडित्यादि यथोदितम् ॥ ८ ॥

---

१ धीरन्त्यशब्दविषयावृत्तवर्णाहितस्मृतिः-ग० ।

विरुद्धार्थं मतं व्यर्थं विरुद्धं तूपदिश्यते ।
पूर्वाऽपरार्थव्याघाताद्विपर्ययकरं यथा ॥ ९ ॥
सखि मानं प्रिये धेहि लघुतामस्य मा गमः ।
भर्तुश्छन्दानुवर्त्तिन्यः प्रेम घ्नन्ति न हि स्त्रियः ॥१०॥
उपासितगुरुत्वात्त्वं विजितेन्द्रियशत्रुषु ।
श्रेयसो विनयाधानमधुना तिष्ठ केवलम् ॥ ११ ॥
यदभिन्नार्थमन्योन्यं तदेकार्थं प्रचक्षते ।
पुनरुक्तमिदं प्राहुरन्ये शब्दार्थभेदतः ॥ १२ ॥
न शब्दपुनरुक्तं तु स्थौल्यादत्रोपवर्ण्यते ।
कथमाक्षिप्तचित्तः सन्नुक्तमेवाऽभिधास्यते ॥ १३ ॥
भयशोकाभ्यसूयासु हर्षविस्मययोरपि ।
यथाह गच्छ गच्छेति पुनरुक्तं च तद्विदुः ॥ १४ ॥
अत्रार्थपुनरुक्तं यत्तदेवैकार्थमिष्यते ।
उक्तस्यपुनराख्याने कार्यासम्भवतो यथा ॥ १५ ॥
तामुत्कमनसं नूनं करोति ध्वनिरम्भसाम् ।
सौधेषु घनमुक्तानां प्रणालीमुखपातिनाम् ॥ १६ ॥
श्रुतेः सामान्यधर्माणां विशेषस्याऽनुदाहृतेः ।
अप्रतिष्ठं यदेकत्र तज्ज्ञानं संशयं विदुः ॥ १७ ॥

---

१ विरूद्धार्थम्-ग०
२ न-ग० । ३ यदत्रैज्ज्ञानं (यदेकत्र तज्ज्ञानं ?)-ग० ।

ससंशयमिति प्राहुस्ततस्तज्जननं वचः ।
इष्टं निश्चितये वाक्यं न वेलायेति (वेलायति?) तद्यथा १८
व्यालवन्तो दुरारोहा रत्नवन्तः फलान्विताः ।
विषमा भूभृतस्तेभ्यो भयमाशु प्रमादिनाम् ॥ १९ ॥
यथोपदेशं क्रमशो निर्देशोऽत्र क्रमो मतः ।
तदपेतं विपर्यासादित्याख्यातमपक्रमम् ॥ २० ॥
विदधानौ किरीटेन्दू श्यामाभ्रहिमसच्छवी ।
रथाङ्गशूले बिभ्राणौ पातां वः शम्भुशार्ङ्गिणौ ॥२१॥
सूत्रकृत्पादकारेष्टप्रयोगाद्योऽन्यथा भवेत् ।
तमाप्तश्रावकाः सिद्धेः[1] शब्दहीनं विदुर्यथा ॥ २२ ॥
स्फुरत्तडिद्वलयिनो विततांभोगरीयसः ।
तेजस्तिरयतः सौरं घनान् पश्य दिवाऽभितः[2] ॥२३॥
यतिश्छन्दो[3]निरूढानां[4] शब्दानां या विचारणा ।
तदपेतं यतिभ्रष्टमिति निर्दिश्यते यथा ॥ २४ ॥
विद्युत्वन्तस्तमालासितवपुष इमे वारिवाहा ध्वनन्ति ।
गुरोर्लघोश्च वर्णस्य योऽस्थाने रचनाविधिः ।
तन्न्यूनाधिकता वापि भिन्नवृत्तमिदं यथा ॥ २५ ॥
भ्रमति भ्रमरमाला काननेषून्मदासौ ।
विरहितरमणीकोऽर्हस्यद्य गन्तुम् ॥ २६ ॥

---

१ तमाप्तश्रावकासिद्धेः-घ० । २ दिवोऽभितः-घ० ।
३ यतिच्छन्दो-घ० । ४ ऽधिरूढानां-क० ।

कान्ते इन्दुशिरोरत्ने आदधाने उदंशुनी ।
पातां वः शम्भुशर्वाण्याविति प्राहुर्विसन्धयः ॥२७॥
या देशे द्रव्यसंभूतिरपि वा नोपदिश्यते ।
तत्तद्विरोधि विज्ञेयं स्वभावात्तद्यथोच्यते ॥२८॥
मलये कन्दरोपान्तरूढकालागुरुद्रुमे ।
सुगन्धिकुसुमानम्रा राजन्ते देवदारवः ॥२९॥
षण्णामृतूनां भेदेन कालः षोढेव भिद्यते ।
तद्विरोधकृदित्याहुर्विपर्यासादिदं यथा ॥ ३० ॥
उदूढ[1]शिशिरासारान् प्रावृषेण्यान् नभस्वतः ।
फुल्लाः सुरभयन्तीमे चूताः काननशोभिनः ॥३१॥
कला सङ्कलनाप्रज्ञा[2] शिल्पान्यस्याश्च गोचरः ।
विपर्यस्तं तथैवाहुस्तद्विरोधकरं यथा ॥३२॥
ऋषभात्पञ्चमात्तस्मात् सषड्जं धैवतं स्मृतम् ।
अयं हि मध्यमग्रामो मध्यमोत्पीडितर्षभः ॥३३॥
इति सा धारितं मोहादन्यथैवा[3]ऽवगच्छति ।
अन्यास्वपि कलास्वेवमभिधेया विरोधिता ॥ ३४ ॥
स्थास्नुजङ्गमभेदेन लोकं तत्त्वविदो विदुः ।
स च तद्व्यवहारोऽत्र तद्विरोधकरं यथा ॥३५॥

---

१ उदूढ–घ० । २ प्रज्ञाः–घ० ।
३ अन्यथेव–घ० ।

तेषां कटतटभ्रष्टैर्गजानां मदबिन्दुभिः ।
प्रावर्त्तत नदी घोरा हस्त्यश्वरथवाहिनी ॥३६॥
धावतां सैन्यवाहानां फेनवारि मुखच्युतम् ।
चकार जानुदघ्नापान् प्रतिदिङ्मुखमध्वनः ॥३७॥
न्यायः शास्त्रं त्रिवर्गोक्तिर्दण्डनीतिं च तां विदुः ।
अतो न्यायविरोधीष्टमपेतं यत्तया यथा ॥३८॥
विजिगीषुमुपन्यस्य वत्सेशं वृद्धदर्शनम् ।
तस्यैव कृतिनः पश्चादभ्यधाच्चा[1]रशून्यताम् ॥३९॥
अन्तर्योधशता[2]कीर्णं सालङ्कायननेतृकम्[3] ।
तथाविधं गजच्छद्म नाऽज्ञासीत् स स्वभूगतम् ॥४०॥
यदि वोपेक्षितं तस्य सचिवैः स्वार्थसिद्धये ।
अहो नु मन्दिमा तेषां भक्तिर्वा नास्ति भर्तरि ॥४१॥
शरा दृढधनुर्मुक्ता मन्युमद्भिररातिभिः ।
मर्माणि परिहृत्याऽस्य पतिष्यन्तीति काऽनुमा ॥४२॥
हतोऽनेन मम भ्राता मम पुत्रः पिता मम ।
मातुलो भागिनेयश्च रुषा संरब्धचेतसः ॥४३॥
अस्यन्तो विविधान्याऽऽजावायुधान्यपराधिनम् ।
एकाकिनमरण्यान्यां न हन्युर्बहवः कथम् ॥४४॥

---

१ पा (चा ?)—ग० । २ अन्तर्योधं शताकीर्ण-घ० ।
३ नेत्र कम्-ग, नेत्रकम् क० ।

नमोऽस्तु तेभ्यो विद्वद्भ्यो येऽभिप्रायं कवेरिमम् ।
शास्त्रलोकावपास्यैव नयन्ति नयवेदिनः ॥४५॥
सचेतसो वनेभस्य चर्मणा निर्मितस्य च ।
विशेषं वेद बालोऽपि कष्टं किं नु कथं नु तत् ॥४६॥
आगमो धर्मशास्त्राणि लोकसीमा च तत्कृता ।
तद्विरोधि तदाचारव्यतिक्रमणतो यथा ॥४७॥
भूभृतां पीतसोमानां न्याय्ये वर्त्मनि तिष्ठताम् ।
अलङ्करिष्णुना वंशं गुरौ सति विजिगीषुणा ॥४८॥
अभार्योढेन संस्कारमन्तरेण द्विजन्मना ।
नरवाहनदत्तेन वेश्यावान् निशि पीडितः ॥४९॥

न दूषणायाऽयमुदाहृतो विधि-
र्न चाभिमानेन किमु प्रतीयते ।
कृतात्मनां तत्त्वदृशां च मादृशो
जनोऽभिसन्धिं क इवाऽवभोत्स्यते ॥ ५० ॥

इति श्रीभामहालङ्कारे चतुर्थः परिच्छेदः ।

१ तु-क० ।

अथ पञ्चमः परिच्छेदः ।

अथ प्रतिज्ञाहेत्वादिहीनं दुष्टं च वर्ण्यते ।
समासेन यथान्यायं तन्मात्रार्थप्रतीतये ॥ १ ॥
प्रायेण दुर्बोधतया शास्त्राद् बिभ्यत्यमेधसः ।
तदुपच्छन्दनायैष हेतुन्यायलवोच्चयः ॥ २ ॥
स्वादुकाव्यरसोन्मिश्रं शास्त्रमप्युपयुञ्जते ।
प्रथमालीढमधवः पिबन्ति कटु भेषजम् ॥ ३ ॥
न स शब्दो न तद्वाच्यं[2] न स न्यायो न सा कला ।
जायते यन्न काव्याङ्गमहो भारो महान् कवेः ॥ ४ ॥
सत्त्वादयः प्रमाणाभ्यां प्रत्यक्षमनुमा च ते ।
असाधारणसामान्यविषयत्वं तयोः किल ॥ ५ ॥
प्रत्यक्षं कल्पनापोढं ततोऽर्थादिति केचन ।
कल्पनां नाम जात्यादियोजनां प्रतिजानते[3] ॥ ६ ॥
समारोपः किलैतावान् सदर्थालम्बनं च तत् ।
जात्याद्यपोहे वृत्तिः क्व क विशेषः कुतश्च सः ॥ ७ ॥
तदपोहेषु च तथा सिद्धा सा बुद्धिगोचरा ।
अवस्तुकं चेद्वितथं[4] प्रत्यक्षं तत्त्ववृत्ति हि ॥ ८ ॥

---

१ 'वलो'-क० । २ तद्वाक्यं-क० । ३ प्रतिजन्यते-घ० । ४ द्वितयं-घ० ।

ग्राह्यग्राहकभेदेन विज्ञानांशो मतो यदि ।
विज्ञानमत्र सादृश्याद्विशेषोऽस्य[1] विकल्पना ॥ ९ ॥
अर्थादेवेति रूपादेस्तत एवेति नान्यतः[2] ।
अन्यथा[3] घटविज्ञानमन्येन व्यपदिश्यते ॥ १० ॥
त्रिरूपाल्लिङ्गतो ज्ञानमनुमानञ्च केचन[4] ।
तद्विदो नान्तरीयार्थदर्शनं चाऽपरे विदुः ॥ ११ ॥
विविधास्पदधर्मेण धर्मीकृतविशेषणः ।
पक्षस्तस्य च निर्देशः प्रतिज्ञेत्यभिधीयते ॥ १२ ॥
तदर्थहेतुसिद्धान्तसर्वागमविरोधिनी ।
विरुद्धधर्मा[5] प्रत्यक्षबाधिनी[6] चेति दुष्यति ॥ १३ ॥
तथैव हि तदर्थस्य विरोधकरणं यथा ।
यतिर्मम पिता बाल्यात् सूनुर्यस्याऽहमौरसः ॥ १४ ॥
अस्त्यात्मा[7] प्रकृतिर्वेति ज्ञेया हेत्वपवादिनी ।
धर्मिणोऽस्याऽप्रसिद्धत्वात्तद्धर्मोऽपि[8] न सेत्स्यति ॥ १५ ॥
शाश्वतोऽशाश्वतो वेति प्रसिद्धे धर्मिणि ध्वनौ ।
जायते भेदविषयो विवादो वादिनोर्मिथः[9] ॥ १६ ॥

---

१ ०स (स्य ?)-ग० ।　२ न्यायतः-ग० ।
३ अन्यदा-ख, घ० ।　४ केन च (केचन ?)-ग० ।
५ प्रसिद्ध-ग० ।　६ वादिनी-ख. घ० ।
७ अस्यात्मा-ग० ।　८ तदर्थोऽपि-क०
९ वादिनो मिश्रः-घ, धादिनो मिश्रः-क०

स्वसिद्धान्तविरोधित्वाद्विज्ञेया तद्विरोधिनी ।
कणभक्षो यथा शब्दमाचक्षीताऽविनश्वरम् ॥१७॥
सर्वशास्त्रविरुद्धत्वात्सर्वागमविरोधिनी ।
यथा शुचिस्तनुः स्त्रैणी तत्प्रमाणानि सन्ति वा[1] ॥१८॥
आकुमारमसन्दिग्धधर्माहितविशेषणा ।
प्रसिद्धधर्मेति मता श्रोत्रग्राह्यो ध्वनिर्यथा ॥ १९ ॥
प्रत्यक्षबाधिनी तेन प्रमाणेनैव बाध्यते ।
यथा शीतोऽनलो नास्ति रूप[2]मुष्णः क्षपाकरः ॥२०॥
सन् पक्षे[3] सदृशे सिद्धो व्यावृत्तस्तद्विपक्षतः ।
हेतुस्त्रिलक्षणो ज्ञेयो हेत्वाभासो विपर्ययात् ॥ २१ ॥
सन् द्वयोरिति यः सिद्धः स्वपक्षपरपक्षयोः ।
अभिन्नलक्षणः पक्षः फलभेदादयं द्विधा ॥ २२ ॥
परपक्षानुपादानं तद्वृत्तेश्चानुदाहृतौ ।
कथमन्यतरासिद्धहेत्वाभासव्यवस्थितिः ॥ २३ ॥
साध्यधर्मानुगमतः सदृशस्तत्र यश्च सन् ।
अन्योऽप्यसावेक इव सामान्यादुपचर्यते ॥ २४ ॥
विपक्षस्तद्विसदृशो व्यावृत्तस्तत्र यो ह्यसन् ।
इति द्वयैकानुगतिर्व्यावृत्तिर्लक्ष्मसाधुता[4] ॥ २५ ॥

---

१ यथा शुचिस्तनुस्त्रीणि प्रमाणानि (न ?) सन्ति वा-ग० ।
२ कूप-क० । ३ द्वयो-ग० ।
४ इति द्वयैकानुगतिव्यावृत्ती लक्ष्मसाधुना-घ०

साध्यसाधनधर्माभ्यां सिद्धो दृष्टान्त उच्यते ।
तद्विपर्ययतो वापि तदाभस्तदवृत्तितः ॥ २६ ॥
साध्येन लिङ्गानुगतिस्तदभावे च नास्तिता ।
ख्याप्यते येन दृष्टान्तः स किलान्यैर्द्विधोच्यते ॥२७॥
दूषणन्यूनताद्युक्तिर्न्यूनं हेत्वादिनाऽत्र[1] च ।
तन्मूलत्वात्कथायाश्च न्यूनं नेष्टं प्रतिज्ञया ॥ २८ ॥
जातयो दूषणाभासास्ताः साधर्म्यसमादयः ।
तासां प्रपञ्चो बहुधा भूयस्त्वादिह नोदितः ॥ २९ ॥
अपरं वक्ष्यते न्यायलक्षणं काव्यसंश्रयम् ।
इदं तु शास्त्रगर्भेषु काव्येष्वभिहितं यथा ॥ ३० ॥
अथ नित्याऽविनाभावि दृष्टं जगति कारणम् ।
कारणं चेन्न तन्नित्यं नित्यं चेत्[2] कारणं न तत् ॥३१॥
लक्ष्मप्रयोगदोषाणां भेदेनानेक[3]वर्त्मना ।
सन्धादिसाधनं सिद्ध्यै शास्त्रेषूदितमन्यथा ॥ ३२ ॥
तज्ज्ञैः काव्यप्रयोगेषु तत्प्रादुष्कृतमन्यथा ।
तत्र लोकाश्रयं काव्यमागमास्तत्त्वशंसिनः[4] ॥ ३३ ॥
असिसङ्काशमाकाशं शब्दो दूरानुपात्ययम् ।
तदेव वाऽपि सिन्धूनामहो स्थेमा महार्चिषः ॥ ३४ ॥

१ ऽथ-ग० । २ नित्यश्चेत्—घ० । ३ ०न-क । ४ दर्शिनः ग० ।

रूपादीनां यथा द्रव्यमाश्रयो नश्वरीति या ।
इष्टकार्याभ्युपगमं प्रतिज्ञां प्रतिजानते ॥ ३५ ॥
धर्मार्थकामकोपानां संश्रयात् सा चतुर्विधा ।
जरामेष बिभर्मीति प्रतिज्ञाय पितुर्यथा ॥
तथैव पुरुणाभारि सा स्याद्धर्मनिबन्धनी ॥ ३६ ॥
उपलप्स्ये स्वयं सीतामिति भर्तृनिदेशतः ।
हनूमता प्रतिज्ञाय सा ज्ञातेत्यर्थसंश्रया ॥ ३७ ॥
आहरिष्याम्यमुमद्य महासेनात्मजामिति ।
कृत्वा प्रतिज्ञां वत्सेन हृतेति मदनाश्रया ॥ ३८ ॥
भ्रातुर्भ्रातृव्यमुन्मथ्य पास्याम्यस्याऽसृगाहवे ।
प्रतिज्ञाय यथा भीमस्तच्चकाराऽवशो रुषा ॥३९॥
कार्योऽन्यत्र प्रतिज्ञायाः प्रयोगो न कथञ्चन ।
परित्यागस्य कर्तव्यो नासां चतसृणामपि ॥ ४० ॥
प्रायोपवेशाय यथा प्रतिज्ञाय सुयोधनः ।
राज्याय पुनरुत्तस्थाविति धर्मविरोधिनी ॥ ४१ ॥
आहूतो न निवर्तेयं द्यूतायेति युधिष्ठिरः ।
कृत्वा सन्धां शकुनिना दिदेवेत्यर्थबाधिनी ॥ ४२ ॥
अद्यारभ्य निवत्स्यामि मुनिवद् वचनादिति ।
पितुः प्रियाय यां भीष्मश्चक्रे सा कामबाधिनी ॥४३॥

---

१ निवर्तेऽहं-ग ।

अत्याजयद्यथा रामः सर्वक्षत्रवधाश्रयाम्।
जामदग्न्यं युधा[1] जित्वा सा ज्ञेया कोपबाधिनी ॥४४॥
अथाऽभ्युपगमप्राप्तिः सन्धाऽभ्युपगमाद्विना।
अनुक्तमपि यत्रार्थादभ्युपैति यथोच्यते ॥ ४५ ॥
किमिन्द्रियद्विषां[2] ज्ञेयं को निराकृतयेऽरिभिः।
को वा गत्वरमर्थिभ्यो न यच्छति धनं लघु ॥४६॥
किमत्ययं तु यः क्षेपः सौकर्य्यं दर्शयत्यसौ।
हेतुस्त्रिलक्ष्मैत्र मतः काव्येष्वपि सुमेधसाम् ॥ ४७ ॥
अन्वयव्यतिरेकौ हि केवलावर्थसिद्धये।
यथाऽभितो वनाभोगमेतदस्ति महत्सरः ॥ ४८ ॥
कूजनात्कुररीणां च कमलानां च सौरभात्।
अन्यधर्मोऽपि तत्सिद्धिं सम्बन्धेन करोत्ययम् ॥४९॥
धूमादभ्रङ्कषात्साग्नेः प्रदेशस्यानुमामिव।
अपृथक्कृतसाध्योऽपि हेतुश्चात्र प्रतीयते ॥ ५० ॥
अन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां विनैवा[3]र्थगतिर्यथा।
दीप्रदीपा निशा जज्ञे व्यपवृत्तदिवाकरा ॥ ५१ ॥
हेतुप्रदीपदीपत्वमपवृत्तौ रवेरिह।
तस्याऽपि सुधियामिष्टा दोषाः प्रागुदितास्त्रयः ॥५२॥
अज्ञानसंशयज्ञानविपर्ययकृतो यथा।

---

१ यथा-घ। २ द्विषां-क। ३ ०का०-क।

काशा हरन्ति हृदयममी कुसुमसौरभार्त्तं ॥ ५३ ॥
अपामम्यर्णवर्त्तित्वादेते ज्ञेयाः शरारयः ।
असौ शुक्लान्तनेत्रत्वाच्चकोर इति गृह्यताम् ॥ ५४ ॥
तुल्यजातावदृष्टत्वात्साधयत्यचकोरताम् ।
उक्तस्याऽर्थस्य दृष्टान्तं प्रतिबिम्बनिदर्शनम् ॥ ५५ ॥
ननूपमानमेवास्तु न हेत्वनभिधानतः ।
साध्यसाधनयोरुक्तिरुक्तादन्यत्र नेष्यते ॥ ५६ ॥
मुखं पद्ममिवेत्यत्र किं साध्यं किञ्च साधनम् ॥
इति प्रयोगस्य यथा कलावपि भवानिह ।
श्रेयान् वृद्धानुशिष्टत्वात् पूर्वे कार्तयुगे यथा ॥५७॥
यत्र दृष्टान्तमात्रेण व्यज्येते साध्यसाधने ।
तमाहुः शुद्धदृष्टान्तं तन्मात्राविष्कृतेर्यथा ॥ ५८ ॥
भरतस्त्वं दिलीपस्त्वं त्वमेवैलः पुरूरवाः ।
त्वमेव वीर प्रद्युम्नस्त्वमेव नरवाहनः ॥ ५९ ॥
कथमेकपदेनैव व्यज्येरन्नस्य ते गुणाः ।
इति प्रयुञ्जते सन्तः केचिद्विस्तरभीरवः ॥ ६० ॥
पदमेकं परं साधु नार्वाचीनं निबन्धनम् ।
वैपरीत्याद्विपर्यासं कीर्तेरपि करोति तत् ॥ ६१ ॥
अहृद्यमसुभि(नि?)भेदं रसवत्त्वेऽप्यपेशलम् ।

---

१ सौहृदात्-क । २ दृष्टानां-घ ।

काव्यं कपित्थमाम्रं त्रत(मंच?) केषाञ्चित्सदृशं यथा॥६२॥

प्रजाजनश्रेष्ठवरिष्ठभूभृ-
च्छिरोचिताङ्घ्रेः पृथुकीर्तिधिष्ण्यं[1]।
अंह्रिप्रपद्मस्य[2] जलारिधाम्न-
स्तवैव नान्यस्य सुतस्य वृत्तम्॥ ६३॥

अंशुमद्भिश्च मणिभिः फलनिम्नैश्च शाखिभिः।
फुल्लैश्च कुसुमैरन्यैर्वाचोऽलङ्कुरुते यथा॥ ६४॥

शुभमरकतपद्मरागचित्रे
सफलसपल्लवभूरिचारुवृक्षे।
बहुकुसमविभूषिते स तस्थौ
सुरमुनिसिद्धयुते सुमेरुपृष्ठे॥ ६५॥

तदेभिरङ्गैर्भूष्यन्ते भूषणोपवनस्रजः।
वाचां वक्रार्थशब्दोक्तिरलङ्काराय कल्पते॥ ६६॥

विरुद्धपदमस्वर्थं बहुपूरणमाकुलम्।
कुर्वन्ति काव्यमपरे व्यायताभीप्सया यथा॥ ६७॥

एलातक्कोलनागस्फुटबकुललताचन्दनस्यन्दनाढ्य-
सृक्काकर्पूरचक्रागुरुमनःशिलाध्यामकाव्यास्ततीरः।
शङ्खव्राताकुलान्तस्तिमिमकरकुलाकीर्णवीचीप्रतानो
दध्रे यस्याऽम्बुराशिः शशिकुमदसुधाक्षीरशुद्धां सुकीर्तिम्॥६८॥

---

[1] धिष्ण्यः-घ। [2] य०-घ।

इति निगदितास्तास्ता वाचामलङ्कृतयो मया
बहुविधकृतीर्दृष्ट्वाऽन्येषां स्वयं परितर्क्य च ।
प्रथितवचसः सन्तोऽभिज्ञाः प्रमाणमिहापरे
गुरुतरधियामस्वाराधं मनोऽकृतबुद्धिभिः ॥ ६९ ॥

इति श्रीभामहालङ्कारे पञ्चमः परिच्छेदः ।

अथ षष्ठः परिच्छेदः ।

सूत्राम्भसं पदावर्त्तं पारायणरसातलम् ।
धातूणादिगणग्राहं ध्यानग्रहबृहत्प्लवम् ॥ १ ॥
धीरैरालोकितप्रान्तममेधोभिरसूयितम् ।
सदोपभुक्तं सर्वाभिरन्यविद्याकरेणुभिः ॥ २ ॥
नापारयित्वा दुर्गाधममुं व्याकरणार्णवम् ।
शब्दरत्नं स्वयङ्गम(म्य?) मलङ्कर्तुमयं जनः ॥ ३ ॥
तस्य चाऽधिगमे यत्नः कार्यः काव्यं विधित्सता ।
परप्रत्ययतो यत्तु क्रियते तेन का रतिः ॥ ४ ॥
नाऽन्यप्रत्ययशब्दा वाग— — —मुदे सताम् ।
परेण धृतमुक्तेव सरसा कुसुमावली ॥ ५ ॥
मुख्यस्तावदयं न्यायो यत स्वशक्त्या प्रवर्तते ।
अन्ये[1] सारस्वता नाम सन्त्यन्योक्तानुवादिनः ॥ ६ ॥
प्रतीतिरर्थेषु यतस्तं[2] शब्दं ब्रुवतेऽपरे ।
धूमभासोरपि प्राप्ता शब्दताऽन्यानुमां प्रति ॥ ७ ॥
नन्वकारादिवर्णानां समुदायोऽभिधेयवान् ।
अर्थप्रतीतये गीतः शब्द इत्यभिधीयते ॥ ८ ॥

---

१ अन्य–ग० । २ च यस्तं–घ ।

प्रत्येकमसमर्थानां समुदायोऽर्थवान् कथम् ।
वर्णानां क्रमवृत्तित्वान् न्याय्या नापि च संहतिः ॥९॥
न चापि समुदायिभ्यः समुदायोऽतिरिच्यते ।
दारुभित्तिभुवोऽतीत्य किमन्यत् सद्म कल्प्यते ॥१०॥
तस्मात् कूटस्थ इत्येषा शाब्दी वः कल्पना वृथा ।
प्रत्यक्षमनुमानं वा यत्र तत्परमार्थतः ॥ ११ ॥
शपथैरपि चादेयं वचो न स्फोटवादिनाम् ।
नभःकुसुममस्तीति श्रद्दध्यात् कः सचेतनः ॥ १२ ॥
इयन्त ईदृशा वर्णा ईदृगर्थाभिधायिनः ।
व्यवहाराय लोकस्य प्रागित्थं समयः कृतः ॥ १३ ॥
स कूटस्थोऽनपायी च नादादन्यश्च कथ्यते ।
मन्दाः साङ्केतिकानर्थान् मन्यन्ते पारमार्थिकान् ॥१४॥
विनश्वरोऽस्तु नित्यो वा सम्बन्धोऽर्थेन वा सता ।
नमोऽस्तु तेभ्यो विद्वद्भ्यः प्रमाणं येऽस्य निश्चितौ ॥१५॥
अन्यापोहेन[2] शब्दोऽर्थमाहेत्यन्ये प्रचक्षते ।
[3]अन्यापोहश्च नामाऽन्यपदार्थाऽपाकृतिः किल ॥१६॥
यदि गौरित्ययं शब्दः कृतार्थोऽन्यनिराकृतौ ।
जनको गवि गोबुद्धेर्मृग्यतामपरो ध्वनिः ॥ १७ ॥

---

१ किमन्यं सत्प्रकल्प्यते-घ । २ अन्यायोहे तु-क ।
३ अन्यापोहश्च नामान्य वा (प?) दार्था वा (पा?) कृतिः किल-ग ।

अर्थज्ञानफलाः शब्दा न चैकस्य फलद्वयम्।
अपवादविधिज्ञाने फले चैकस्य वः कथम् ॥ १८ ॥
पुरा गौरिति विज्ञानं गोशब्दश्रवणाद् भवेत्।
येनाऽगोप्रतिषेधाय प्रवृत्तो गौरिति ध्वनिः ॥ १९ ॥
वर्णभेदादिदं भिन्नं वर्णाः स्वांशविकल्पतः।
के शब्दाः किञ्च तद्वाच्यमित्यहो वर्त्म दुस्तरम् ॥ २० ॥
द्रव्यक्रियाजातिगुणभेदात् ते च चतुर्विधाः।
यदृच्छाशब्दमप्यन्ये डित्थादि प्रतिजानते ॥ २१ ॥
नानाभाषाविषयिणामपर्यन्तार्थवर्त्तिनाम्।
इयत्ता केन वाऽमीषां विशेषादवधार्यते ॥ २२ ॥
वक्रवाचां कवीनां ये प्रयोगं प्रति साधवः।
प्रयोक्तुं ये न युक्ताश्च तद्विवेकोऽयमुच्यते ॥ २३ ॥
नाऽप्रयुक्तं प्रयुञ्जीत चेतःसंमोहकारिणम्।
तुल्यार्थत्वेऽपि हि ब्रूयात् को हन्ति गतिवाचिनम् ॥ २४ ॥
श्रोत्रादिं न तु दुर्बोधं न दुष्टादिमपेशलम्।
ग्राम्यं न पिण्डीशूरादिं न डित्थादिमपार्थकम् ॥ २५ ॥
नाऽप्रतीतान्यथार्थत्वं धात्वनेकार्थतावशात्।
न लेशज्ञापकाकृष्टसंहति ध्याति वा यथा ॥ २६ ॥
न शिष्टैरुक्तमित्येव न तन्त्रान्तरसाधितम्।
छन्दोवदिति चोत्सर्गान्न चापि च्छान्दसं वदेत् ॥ २७ ॥

क्रमागतं श्रुतिसुखं शब्दमर्थ्यमुदीरयेत् ।
अतिशेते ह्यलङ्कारमन्यं व्यञ्जनचारुता ॥ २८ ॥

सिद्धो यश्चोपसंख्यानादिष्ट्या यश्चोपपादितः ।
तमाद्रियेत प्रायेण न तु योगविभागजम् ॥ २९ ॥

इयं चन्द्रमुखी कन्या प्रकृत्यैव मनोहरा ।
अस्यां सुवर्णालङ्कारः पुष्णाति नितरां श्रियम् ॥३०॥

वृद्धिपक्षं प्रयुञ्जीत सङ्क्रमेऽपि मृजेर्यथा ।
मार्जन्त्यधररागं ते पतन्तो बाष्पबिन्दवः ॥ ३१ ॥

सरूपशेषं तु पुमान् स्त्रिया यत्र च शिष्यते ।
यथाह वरुणाविन्द्रौ भवौ शर्वौ मृडाविति ॥ ३२ ॥

यथा पटयतीत्यादि णिच् प्रातिपदिकात्ततः ।
णाविष्ठवदितीष्ट्या च तथा क्रशयतीत्यपि ॥ ३३ ॥

प्रयुञ्जीताऽव्ययीभावमदन्तं नाप्यपञ्चमि ।
तृतीयासप्तमीपक्षे नालुग्विषयमानयेत् ॥ ३४ ॥

तिष्ठद्गुप्रभृतौ वाच्यौ नक्तंदिवसगोचरौ ।
यथा विद्वानधीतेऽसौ तिष्ठद्गु च वहद्गु च ॥३५॥

शिष्टप्रयोगमात्रेण न्यासकारमतेन वा ।
तृचा समस्तषष्ठीकं न कथञ्चिदुदाहरेत् ॥ ३६ ॥

---

१ श्य०—ग ।

सूत्रज्ञापकमात्रेण वृत्रहन्ता यथोदितः ।
अकेन च न कुर्वीत वृत्तिं तद्गमको यथा ॥३७॥
पञ्चराजीति च यथा प्रयुञ्जीत द्विगुः स्त्रियाम् ।
नपुंसकं तत्पुरुषं पुरुहूतसभं यथा ॥ ३८ ॥
सर्वेभ्यश्च भृशादिभ्यो वदेल्लुप्तहलं यथा ।
प्रियोन्मनायते सा ते किं शठाऽभिमनायसे ॥३९॥
तृतीयैकवचैः[1] षष्ठ्यामामन्तं च वदेत् क्विपि ।
यथोदितं बलभिदा सुरुचां विद्युतामिव ॥ ४० ॥
असन्तमपि यद्वाक्यं तत्तथैव प्रयोजयेत् ।
यथोच्यतेऽम्भसां भासा यशसामम्भसामिति ॥ ४१ ॥
पुंसि स्त्रियां च[2] क्वस्वन्तमिच्छन्त्यच्छान्दसं किल ।
उपेयुषामपि दिवं यथा न व्येति चारुता ॥ ४२ ॥
इभकुम्भनिभौ[3] बाला दधुषी कन्तुके[4] स्तनौ ।
रतिखेदपरिश्रान्ता जहार हृदयं नृणाम् ॥ ४३ ॥
शबलादिभ्यो नितरां भाति णिज् विहितो यथा ।
बलाकाः पश्य सुश्रोणि घनाञ्छबलयन्त्यमूः ॥४४॥
शिशिरासारकणिकां सद्दशस्ते तु कङ्कवत् ।
संवीजयति सुश्रोणि रतिखेदालसेक्षणाम् ॥ ४५ ॥

---

१ तृतीयैव चतुः षष्ठ्या—क । २ पुंस्त्रियां च—ग ।
३ इभकुम्भनिभे—ग । ४ कन्तुकौ—घ ।

एवं णिचः प्रयोगस्तु सर्वत्राऽलङ्कृतिः परा।
लिङ्गत्रयोपपन्नं च ताच्छील्यविषयं णिनिम् ॥ ४६ ॥
तस्या हारी स्तनाभोगो वदनं हारि सुन्दरम्।
हारिणी तनुरत्यन्तं कियन्न हरते मनः॥ ४७ ॥
ताच्छील्यादिषु चेष्यन्ते सर्व एव तृनादयः[1]।
विशेषणैव[2] तत्रेष्टा युत्कुरज्वरजिष्णुचः ॥ ४८ ॥
क्तिन्नन्तं च प्रयुञ्जीत सङ्गतिः संहतिर्यथा।
शकारौ जागुरिष्टौ च जागर्या जागरा यथा ॥ ४९ ॥
उपासनेति च युचं नित्यमासेः प्रयोजयेत्।
ल्युटं च कर्तृविषयं देवनो रमणो यथा ॥ ५० ॥
अण्णान्तादपि ङीबिष्टो लक्ष्मीः पौरन्दरी यथा।
अण् महारजनाल्लाक्षारोचनाभ्यां तथा च ठक् ॥५१॥
ड्मतुबिष्टं च कुमुदाद्यर्थेयं भूः कुमुद्वती।
ठक् चापि तेन जयतीत्याक्षिकः शास्त्रिको यथा ॥५२॥
हितप्रकरणे णं च सर्वशब्दात् प्रयुञ्जते।
ततश्छमिष्ठ्यां[3] च यथा सार्वः सर्वीय इत्यपि ॥ ५३ ॥
वदेदिमनिजन्तं च पाटिमा लघिमा यथा।
विशेषणेयसुन्निष्टो ज्यायानपि कनीयसीम् ॥ ५४ ॥

---

१ सर्व एवाऽत्र नादयः—ग। २ विशेषेण च—ग।
३ ततश्चमिष्टथा—क।

द्वयसज्दध्नचाविष्टौ प्रमाणविषयौ यथा ।
जानुदघ्नी सरिन् नारीनितम्बद्वयसं सरः ॥ ५५ ॥
मतुप्प्रकरणो ज्योत्स्नातमिस्राशृङ्गिणादयः ।
इनच्च फलबर्हाभ्यां फलिनो बर्हिणो यथा ॥ ५६ ॥
इनिः प्रयुक्तःप्रायेण तथा ठंश्च मनीषिभिः ।
तत्रापि मेखलामालामायानां सुतरां मता ॥ ५७ ॥
अभ्यस्ताज्झेरदादेशे दधतीत्यादयोऽपि च ।
रोदितिस्वपितीत्यादि सहेटा सार्वधातुधकम् ॥ ५८ ॥
अभ्यस्तेषु प्रयोक्तव्यमदन्तं च विदेः शतुः ।
असौ दधदलङ्कारं स्रजं विभ्रच्च शोभते ॥ ५९ ॥
......................रं योगिनं वदेत् ।
यथैतच्छ्यामभाति वनं वनजलोचने ॥ ६० ॥
नैकत्रौकारभूयस्त्वं गतो धातो हतो यथा ।
सावर्ण्यवत्सयोर्भस्य भूयान्नान्यत्र पद्धतेः ॥ ६१ ॥

सालातुरीयमतमेतदनुक्रमेण
को वक्ष्यतीति विरतोऽहमतो विचारात् ।
शब्दार्णवस्य यदि कश्चिदुपैति पारं
भीमाम्भसश्च जलधेरिति विस्मयोऽसौ ॥६२॥

१ भूयान्ना०—क ।

विद्यानां सततमपाश्रयोऽपरासां
तासूक्तान्[1] च विरुणद्धि कांश्चिदर्थान् ।
श्रद्धेयं जगति मतं हि पाणिनीयं
माध्यस्थ्याद् भवति न कस्यचित्प्रमाणम् ॥६३॥

अवलोक्य मतानि सत्कवीना-
मवगम्य स्वधिया च काव्यलक्ष्म ।
सुजनावगमाय भामहेन
ग्रथितं रक्रि[2]लगोमिसूनुनेदम् ॥ ६४ ॥

इति श्रीभामहालङ्कारे षष्ठः परिच्छेदः ।

षष्ठ्या शरीरं निर्णीतं शतषष्ठ्या त्वलङ्कृतिः ।
पञ्चाशता दोषदृष्टिः सप्तत्या न्यायनिर्णयः ॥
षष्ठ्या शब्दस्य शुद्धिः स्यादित्ये[3]वं वस्तुपञ्चकम् ।
उक्तं षड्भिः परिच्छेदैर्भामहेन क्रमेण वः ॥

इति ।

---

१ तासूक्तां न—ग । २ वकिल—क, रक्रिल—घ ।
३ स्यादित्येव—ग ।

परिशिष्ट १

येषामाचार्याणां ग्रन्थेषु भामहीयकाव्यालङ्कारस्थश्लोकाः केनापि रूपेणोपलभ्यन्ते, तेषां समुद्धृतश्लोकरूपादिप्रदर्शनपूर्वकमकारादिवर्णक्रमेण नामसमुद्देशोऽत्र क्रियते ।

अप्पयदीक्षितः स्वचित्रमीमांसायां—

१४ पृष्ठे—यत्र तेनैव तस्य स्यादुपमानोपमेयता ।
असादृश्यविवक्षातो वदन्ति तमनन्वयम् ॥ ३. ४५.

४२ पृष्ठे—अद्य या मम गोविन्द जाता त्वयि गृहागते
कालेनैषा भवेत् प्रीतिस्तवैवागमनात् पुनः ॥ ३. ५.

अभिनवगुप्तो ध्वन्यालोकलोचने—

१० पृष्ठे—शब्दश्छन्दोविधानर्थः, १. ९.

१२ पृष्ठे—धर्म्मार्थकाममोक्षेषु वैचक्षण्यं कलासु च ।
करोति कीर्तिं प्रीतिं च साधुकाव्यनिषेवणम् ॥ १. २.

× × × ×

उपेयुषामपि दिवं सन्निबन्धविधायिनाम्
आस्त एव निरातङ्कं कान्तं काव्यमयं वपुः ॥ १.६.

३६ पृष्ठे—प्रतिषेध इवेष्टस्य यो विशेषाभिधित्सया ।
वक्ष्यमाणोक्तविषयः स आक्षेपो द्विधा मतः ॥ २. ६८.
अहं त्वा यदि नेक्षेय क्षणमप्युत्सुका ततः ।
इयदेवास्त्वतोऽन्येन किमुक्तेनाप्रियेण ते ॥ २. ६९.

३८ पृष्ठे—आदिमध्यान्तविषयं त्रिधा दीपकमिष्यते । २. २५.

× × × ×

अपन्हुतिरभीष्टस्य किञ्चिदर्थगतोपमा ।

× × × ×

नेयं विरौति भृङ्गाली मदेन मुखरा मुहुः ।

अयमाकृष्यमाणस्य कन्दर्पधनुषो ध्वनिः ॥

एकदेशस्य विगमे या गुणान्तरसंस्थितिः ।

विशेषप्रथनायासौ विशेषोक्तिरिति स्मृता ॥

स एकस्त्रीणि जयति जगन्ति कुसुमायुधः ।

हरतापि तनुं यस्य शम्भुना न हृतं बलम् ॥ ३.३१-२४

४० पृष्ठे–मदो जनयति प्रीतिं सानङ्गं मानभङ्गुरम् ।

स प्रियासङ्गमोत्कण्ठां साऽसह्यां मनसः शुचम् ॥२.२७.

गृहेष्वध्वसु वा नान्नं भुञ्ज्महे यदधीतिनौ ।

विप्रा न भुञ्जते . . . . . . ॥ ३. ९.

४१ पृष्ठे–तुल्योदयावसानत्वाद् गतेऽस्तं प्रति भास्वति ।

वासाय वासरः क्लान्तो विशतीव तमोगुहाम् ॥ ३. ४८.

४२ पृष्ठे–अधिकारादपेतस्य वस्तुनोऽन्यस्य या स्तुतिः

अप्रस्तुतप्रशंसा सा त्रिविधा परिकीर्तिता । ३. २९.

१०७ पृष्ठे–उपमानेन तत्त्वं च भेदं च वदतः पुनः ।

ससन्देहं वचः स्तुत्यै ससन्देहं विदुर्यथा ॥ ३. ४३.

१८२ पृष्ठे–स्वादुकाव्यरसोन्मिश्रं वाक्यार्थमुपयुञ्जते

प्रथमालीढमधवः पिबन्ति कटु भेषजम् । ५. ३.

२०८ पृष्ठे–वक्राभिधेयशब्दोक्तिरिष्टा वाचामलङ्कृतिः । १. ३६.

२०९ पृष्ठे–अयं मन्दद्युतिर्भास्वानस्तं प्रति यियासति

उदयः पतनायेति श्रीमतो बोधयन्नरान् । ३. ३४.

आनन्दवर्धनो ध्वन्यालोके—

२०८ पृष्ठे–सैषा सर्वत्र वक्रोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते ।

यन्नोऽस्यां कविना कार्यः कोऽलङ्कारोऽनया विना॥२.८५.

उद्भटः काव्यालङ्कारसङ्ग्रहे—

५८ पृष्ठे-अपन्हुतिरभीष्टा च किञ्चिदन्तर्गतोपमा।
भूतार्थपह्नवेनास्या निबन्धः क्रियते बुधैः॥ ३. २१.

केशवमिश्रोऽलङ्कारशेखरे—

१८ पृष्ठे-क्वचिदग्रे प्रसरता क्वचिदापत्य निघ्नता।
शुनेव सारङ्गकुलं त्वया भिन्नं द्विषां बलम्॥ २. ५४.

४९ पृष्ठे-रसवद्दर्शितस्पष्टशृङ्गारादिरसादयम्।

जयमङ्गलो भट्टिकाव्यटीकायां दशमसर्गस्य—

श्लोके १मे-स्वरूपवर्णविन्यासमनुप्रासं प्रचक्षते। २. ५.
तुल्यश्रुतीनां भिन्नानामभिधेयैः परस्परम्।
वर्णानां यः पुनर्वादो यमकं तन्निरूप्यते॥ २. १७.

,, २३तमे-मदो जनयति प्रीतिमानन्दं मानभङ्गुरम्।
यत्प्रियासङ्गमोत्कण्ठामसह्यां मनसः शुचम्॥ २. २७.

,, २६ तमे-उपमानेन तुल्यत्वमुपमेयस्य रूप्यते।
गुणानां समतां दृष्ट्वा रूपकं नाम तद्विदुः॥ २. २१.

,, ३०तमे-विरुद्धेनोपमानेन देशकालक्रियादिभिः।
उपमेयस्य यत्साम्यं गुणमात्रेण सोपमा॥ २. ३०.

,, ३६ तमे-उपन्यसनमर्थस्य प्रक्रान्तादपरस्य यत्।
ज्ञेयः सोऽर्थान्तरन्यासः पूर्वार्थानुगतो यथा॥ २.७१.

,, ३८ तमे-प्रतिषेध इवेष्टस्य यो विशेषाभिधित्सया।
आक्षेप इति तं सन्तः शसन्ति द्विविधो यथा॥२.६८.

,, ४० तमे-उपमानवतोऽर्थस्य यद्विशेषनिदर्शनम्।
व्यतिरेकं तमिच्छन्ति विशेषापादनाद्यथा॥ २. ७५.

,, ४१ तमे-क्रियायाः प्रतिषेधेन तत्फलस्य विभावनात्।

ज्ञेया विभावनैवासौ सान्वर्थं कथ्यते यथा॥ २. ७७.

श्लोके ४२ तमे–यत्रोक्तेर्गम्यतेऽन्योऽर्थस्तत्समानविशेषणः।
सा समासोक्तिरुदिता संक्षिप्तार्थतया यथा॥ २. ७९.

,, ४३ तमे–निमित्ततो यत्र वचो लोकातिक्रान्तगोचरम्।
मन्यन्तेऽतिशयोक्तिं तामलङ्कारतया यथा॥ २. ८१.

,, ४४ तमे–भूयसामुपदिष्टानां क्रियाणामथ कर्मणाम्।
क्रमशो योऽनुनिर्देशो यथासंख्यं तदुच्यते॥ २. ८९.

,, ४५ तमे–अविवक्षितसामान्यात् किञ्चिच्चोपमया सह।
अतद्गुणक्रियारोपादुत्प्रेक्षातिशयान्विता॥ २. ९१.

,, ४६ तमे–स्वभावोक्तिरलङ्कार इति केचित् प्रचक्षते।
अर्थस्य तादवस्थ्ये च स्वभावोऽभिहितो यथा॥ २.९३.
गतोऽस्तमर्को भातीन्दुर्यान्ति वासाय पक्षिणः।
इत्येवमादिकं काव्यं वार्तामेतां प्रचक्षते॥ २. ८७.

,, ४८ तमे–रसवद्दर्शितं स्पष्टं शृंगारादिरसं यथा। ३. ६.

,, ५० तमे–पर्यायोक्तं यदन्येन प्रकारेणाभिधीयते। ३. ८.

,, ५३ तमे–एतदेवापरेऽन्येन वाक्यार्थेनान्यथा विदुः।
नानारत्नवियुक्तं यत्तत् किलोदारमुच्यते। ३.१२.

,, ५५ तमे–उपमानेन यत्तत्त्वमुपमेयस्य साध्यते।
क्रियागुणाभ्यां नाम्ना च श्लिष्टं तदभिधीयते॥३.१४.
लक्षणं रूपकेऽपीदं विद्यते काममत्र तु।
इष्टः प्रयोगो युगपदुपमानोपमेययोः॥ ३. १५.
श्लेषादेवार्थवचसो यस्य च क्रियते भिदा।
तत्सहोक्त्युपमाहेतुनिर्देशात् त्रिविधं यथा॥ ३. १७.

,, ५८ तमे–अपन्हुतिरितीष्टात्र किञ्चिदन्तर्गतोपमा।
भूतार्थापन्हवादेषा क्रियतेऽस्या भिदा यथा॥ ३.२१.

श्लोके ५९ तमे–एकदेशस्य विगमे या गुणान्तरसंस्तुतिः ।
विशेषप्रथनायासौ विशेषोक्तिर्मता यथा ॥ ३. २३.
" ६० तमे–दूराधिकगुणस्तोत्रव्यपदेशेन तुल्यता ।
किञ्चित्‌विधित्सया निन्दा व्याजस्तुतिरसौ यथा ॥ ३.३१.
" ६१ तमे–उपमानस्य तद्भावमुपमेयस्य रूपयन्
यो वदत्युपमाभेदमुपमारूपकं यथा । ३. ३५.
" ६२ तमे–न्यूनस्यापि विशिष्टेन गुणसाम्यविवक्षया ।
तुल्यकार्यक्रियायोगादित्युक्ता तुल्ययोगिता । ३. २७.
" ६३ तमे–क्रिययैव तदर्थस्य विशिष्टस्योपदर्शनात्
इष्टा निदर्शना नाम यथेववतिभिर्विना । ३. ३३.
" ६४ तमे–गुणस्य च क्रियाया वा विरुद्धान्यक्रियाभिधा
क्रियाविशेषाभिधानाय विरोधं तं विदुर्यथा । ३.३५.
" ६५ तमे–उपमानोपमेयत्वं यत्र पर्यायतो भवेत्
उपमेयोपमां धीरा ब्रुवते तां यथोदिताम् । ३. ३७.
" ६६ तमे–तुल्यकालक्रिये यत्र वस्तुद्वयसमाश्रिते
वाक्येनैकेन कथ्येते सहोक्तिः सा मता यथा । ३.३९.
" ६७ तमे–विशिष्टस्य यदादानमन्यापोहेन वस्तुनः
अर्थान्तरन्यासवती परिवृत्तिरसौ यथा । ३. ४१.
" ६८ तमे–उपमानोपमेयस्य तत्त्वं च वदतः पुनः
ससन्देहवचः स्तुत्यै ससन्देहं विदुर्यथा । ३. ४३.
" ६९ तमे–यत्र तेनैव तस्य स्यादुपमानोपमेयता
सादृश्यस्याविवक्षातस्तमित्याहुरनन्वयम् । ३. ४५.
" ७० तमे–श्लिष्टस्यार्थेन संयुक्तः किञ्चिच्चोत्प्रेक्षयान्वितः
रूपकार्थेन च पुनरुत्प्रेक्षावयवो यथा । ३. ४७.
" ७१ तमे–परा विभूषा संसृष्टिर्बहलङ्कारयोगतः

रचिता रत्नमालेव सा चैवं कथ्यते यथा । ३. ४९.

श्लोके ७२ तमे-आशीरपि केषाञ्चिदलङ्कारतया मता

सौहृदस्याविरोधोक्तौ प्रयोगोऽस्याश्च तद्यथा ३.५५.

द्वादशसर्गस्य

" १ मे-भाविकत्वमिति प्राहुः प्रबन्धविषयं गुणम्

प्रत्यक्षा इव दृश्यन्ते यत्रार्था भूतभाविनः ।

चित्रोदात्ताद्भुतार्थत्वं कथायास्वभिनीतता

शब्दानाकुलता चेति तस्य हेतुं प्रचक्षते । ३.५३-५४.

दण्डी काव्यादर्शस्य—

द्वितीयपरिच्छेदस्थे—

" २६६ तमे-अद्य या मम गोविन्द जाता त्वयि गृहागते

कालेनैषा भवेत् प्रीतिस्तवैवागमनात् पुनः ३. ९

तृतीय परिच्छेदस्थे

" १२० तमे-हिमापहामित्रधरैर्व्याप्तं व्योमाभिनन्दति । १. ४१

" १२५ तमे-अपार्थं व्यर्थमेकार्थं ससंशयमपक्रमम्

शब्दहीनं यतिभ्रष्टं भिन्नवृत्तं विसन्धिकम् । ४. १.

" १२६ तमे-देशकालकलालोकन्यायागमविरोधि च । ४. २.

" १२८ तमे-समुदायार्थशून्यं यत्तदपार्थमितीष्यते । ४. ८.

नमिसाधू रुद्रटकृतकाव्यालङ्कारटीकायां—

१३ पृष्ठे-प्राकृतं संस्कृतं चैतदपभ्रंश इति त्रिधा । १. १६.

१४५,,-स मारुताकम्पितपीतवासा

विभ्रत् सलीलं शशिभासि शंखम् ।

यदुप्रवीरः प्रगृहीतशार्ङ्गः

सेन्द्रायुधो मेघ इवावभासे ॥ २. ४१.

स पीतवासाः प्रगृहीतशार्ङ्गो
मनोन्य (?) भीमं वपुराप कृष्णः।
शतह्रदेन्द्रायुधवान् निशायां
संसृज्यमानः शशिनेव मेघः ॥ २. ५८.
निपेतुरास्यादिव तस्य दीप्ताः
शरा धनुर्मण्डलमध्यभाजः।
जाज्वल्यमाना इव वारिधारा
दिनार्धभाजः परिवेषिणोऽर्कात् ॥ २. ४७.

१४६ पृष्ठे–अयं पद्मासनासीनश्चक्रवाको विराजते।
युगादौ भगवान् ब्रह्मा विनिर्मित्सुरिव प्रजाः॥ २.५५
वनेऽथ तस्मिन् वनिताविहारिणः
प्रभिन्नदानार्द्रकटा मतङ्गजाः।
विचित्रबर्हाभरणाश्च बर्हिणो
बभुर्दिवीवामलविग्रहा ग्रहाः। २. ६३.

प्रतिहारेन्दुराज उद्भटकृतकाव्यालङ्कारलघुवृत्तौ—

४७ पृष्ठे–ससहोक्त्युपमाहेतुनिर्देशात् त्रिविधं यथा। ३. १७.

६२ पृष्ठे –अयं मन्दद्युतिर्भास्वानस्तं प्रति यियासति
उदयः पतनायेति श्रीमतो बोधयन् नरान्। ३. ३६.

७४ पृष्ठे–चित्रोदात्ताद्भुतार्थत्वं कथाया स्वभिनीतता।
शब्दानाकुलता चेति तस्य हेतुं प्रचक्षते। ३.५४.

७८ पृष्ठे –वृत्तदेवादिचरितशंसि चोत्पाद्यवस्तु च
कलाशास्त्राश्रयं चेति चतुर्धा भिद्यते पुनः। १. १७.

प्रेमचन्द्रतर्कवागीशः काव्यादर्शटीकायां—

प्रथमपरिच्छेदस्य—

१ श्लोके–सुपां तिङां च व्युत्पत्तिं वाचां वाञ्छन्त्यलङ्कृतिम्

तदेतदादुः सौशब्द्यं नार्थव्युत्पतिरीदृशी । १. १४.

द्वितीयपरिच्छेदस्य

२२० श्लोके–सैषा सर्वैव वक्रोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते
यत्नोऽस्यां कविना कार्यः कोऽलङ्कारोऽनया विना २.८५.

२३५ " –हेतुश्च सूक्ष्मलेशौ च नालङ्कारतया मता
समुदायाभिधेयस्य वक्रोक्त्यनभिधानतः । ३' ८६.

तृतीयपरिच्छेदस्य

१२७ "– प्रतिज्ञाहेतुदृष्टान्तहीनं दुष्टं च नेष्यते । ४. २.

भोजराजः सरस्वतीकण्ठाभरणे—

२६ पृष्ठे–असितर्तितुगद्रिच्छित् स्वःक्षितां पतिरद्रिदृक्
अमिद्भिः शुभ्रदृग्दष्टैर्द्विषो जघ्नीयिषीष्ट वः । १. ४६.

४९० पृष्ठे–किंशुकव्यपदेशेन तरुमारुह्य सर्वतः
दग्धादग्धामरण्यानां पश्यतीव विभावसुः । १. ९२.

मम्मटः काव्यप्रकाशस्य

षष्ठोल्लासे

–रूपकादिरलङ्कारस्तस्यान्यैर्बहुधोदितः
न कान्तमपि निर्भूषं विभाति वनिताननम् ।
रूपकादिमलङ्कारं बाह्यमाचक्षते परे
सुपां तिङां च व्युत्पत्तिं वाचां वाञ्छन्त्यलङ्कृतिम् ।
तदेतदादुः सौशब्द्यं नार्थव्युत्पत्तिरीदृशी
शब्दाभिधेयालङ्कारभेदादिष्टं द्वयं तु नः । १.१३–१५.

दशमोल्लासे–सैषा सर्वत्र वक्रोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते
यत्नोऽस्यां कविभिः कार्यः कोऽलङ्कारोऽनया विना२८५
अयं पद्मासनासीनश्चक्रवाको विराजते
युगादौ भगवान् वेधाः विनिर्मित्सुरिव प्रजाः २.५५.

स पीतवासाः प्रगृहीतशार्ङ्गो
मनोज्ञभीमं वपुराप कृष्णः ।
शतह्रदेन्द्रायुधवान् निशायां
संसृज्यमानः शशिनेव मेघः ॥ २. ५८.
निपेतुरास्यादिव तस्य दीप्ताः
शरा धनुर्मण्डलमध्यभाजः ।
जाज्वल्यमाना इव वारिधाराः
दिनार्धभाजः परिवेषिणोऽर्कात् ॥ २. ४७.

मल्लिनाथो भट्टिकाव्यटीकायां—

एकादशसर्गस्य

१ मे श्लोके–श्राव्यं नातिसमस्तार्थं काव्यं मधुरमिष्यते
आविद्वदङ्गनाबालप्रतीतार्थं प्रसादवत् । २. ३.

द्वादशसर्गस्य

१ मे श्लोके–भाविकत्वमिति प्राहुः प्रबन्धविषयं गुणम्
प्रत्यक्षा इव दृश्यन्ते यत्रार्था भूतभाविनः ।
उदात्तार्थाद्भुतार्थत्वे कथायास्त्वभिनीतता
शब्दानाकुलता चेति तस्य हेतुं प्रचक्षते २. ५३-५४.

रुय्यकोऽलङ्कारसर्वस्वे

१८३ पृष्ठे–शब्दानुकूलता चेति तस्य हेतून् प्रचक्षते २. ५४.

वल्लभः सुभाषितावल्यां—

१५४६ –किंशुकव्यपदेशेन तरुमारुह्य सर्वतः
दग्धादग्धमरण्यान्यां पश्यतीव विभावसुः । २. ९२.

१६४४–नेयं विरौति भृङ्गाली मदेन मधुरस्वरा
अयमाकृष्यमाणस्य कन्दर्पधनुषो ध्वनिः । ३. २२.

वामनः स्वकाव्यालङ्कारसूत्रवृत्तौ—

पृष्ठे—सूर्यांशुसंमीलितलोचनेषु
दीनेषु पद्मानिलनिर्मलेषु ।
साध्व्यः स्वगेहेष्विव भर्तृहीनाः
केका विनेशुः शिखिनां मुखेषु ॥ २. ४६.

विश्वेश्वरपण्डितोऽलङ्कारकौस्तुभे--

२३ पृष्ठे—यत्र तेनैव तस्य स्यादुपमानोपमेयता
अप्ताहश्यविवक्षातो वदन्ति तमनन्वमम् । ३. ४५.

हेमचन्द्रः काव्यानुशासने--

१७ पृष्ठे—गतोऽस्तमर्को भातीन्दुर्यान्ति वासाय पक्षिणः
इत्येवमादि किं काव्यं वार्तामेनां प्रचक्षते॥२. ८७.

२८ " –नेयं विरौति भृङ्गाली मदेन मुखरा मुहुः
अयमाकृष्यमाणस्य कन्दर्पधनुषो ध्वनिः । ३. २२.

२६८ " –अहं त्वां यदि नेक्षेय क्षणमप्युत्सुका ततः
इयदेवास्त्वतोऽन्येन किमुक्तेनाप्रियेण ते २. ६९.

२७० " –स एकस्त्रीणि जयति जगन्ति कुसुमायुधः
हरतापि तनुं यस्य शम्भुना न हृतं बलम्। ३. २४.

काव्यानुशासनटीकायां—

७ पृष्ठे—न स शब्दो न तद्वाच्यं न स न्यायो न सा कला
जायते यन्न काव्याङ्गमहो भारो गुरुः कवेः ।

२६७ पृष्ठे–सैषा सर्वैव वक्रोक्तिरनयार्थो विभाव्यते
यत्नोऽस्यां कविना कार्यः कोऽलङ्कारोऽनया विना२८५.

२७९ ,, –व्यालवन्तो दुरारोहा रत्नवन्तः फलान्विताः
विषमाः भूभृतस्तेभ्यो भयमाशु प्रमादिनाम् ४. १९. ॥

परिशिष्ट २

भामहीयकाव्यालङ्कारस्थश्लोकनां

वर्णानुक्रमणी ।

परिशिष्ट ३

काव्यालङ्कारे समुल्लिखितानां ग्रन्थानां ग्रन्थकर्तॄणां च

वर्णक्रमेण नामानि–

INDEX

यथा वा—

निरुच्छ्वसितरीतयो विघटिताक्षिपक्ष्मक्रिया-
निरीहनिखिलेन्द्रियाः प्रतिनिवृत्तचिद्वृत्तयः ।
अवेक्ष्य कुरुमण्डले रहसि पुण्डरीकेक्षणं-
व्रजाम्बुजदृशोऽभजन् कनकशालभञ्जीश्रियम् ॥

विश्लेषाद्यथा हंसदूते—

कदा चित्खेदाग्निं विघटयितुमन्तर्गतमसौ
सहालीभिर्लेभे तरलितमना यामुनतटीम् ।
चिरादस्याश्चित्तं परिचितकुटीरावकलना-
दवस्थास्तस्तार स्फुटमथ सुषुप्तेः प्रियसखी ॥

भयाद्यथा—

मुकुन्दमाविष्कृतविश्वरूपं-
निरूपयन्वानरवर्य्यकेतुः ।
करारबिन्दात्पुरतः स्खलन्तं-
न गाण्डिवं खण्डितधीर्विवेद ॥

विषादाद्यथा श्रीदशमे—

कृष्णं महाबकग्रस्तं दृष्ट्वा रामादयोऽर्भकाः ।
बभूवुरिन्द्रियाणीव विना प्राणं विचेतसः ॥

अस्यान्यत्रात्मपर्य्यन्ते स्यात्सर्वत्रैव मूढता ॥

दुर्गमसङ्गमनी ।

निरुच्छ्वसितेति । निर्गता उच्छ्वसितानां रीतयः प्रचारा याभ्यः, शालभञ्जी=प्रतिमा ।

अत्र कुटीरो लतागृहं तदवकलनात् सुषुप्तेस्तुल्यत्वात् प्रियसखीव याऽवस्था मोहरूपा सा चित्तं तस्तार=आच्छादितवती ।

अस्य प्राप्तमोहस्य भगवद्भक्तस्य, कृष्णस्फूर्त्तिविशेषस्त्विति । इत्या-

तत्रेष्टश्रुत्या यथा श्रीदशमे—

गावश्च कृष्णमुखनिर्गतवेणुगीत-
पीयूषमुत्तमितकर्णपुटैः पिबन्त्यः ।
साम्बाः स्नुतस्तनपयःकबलाः स्म तस्थु-
र्गोविन्दमात्मनि दृशाऽश्रुकलाः स्पृशन्त्यः ॥

अनिष्टश्रुत्या यथा—

आकलय्य परिवर्त्तितगोत्रां केशवस्य गिरमर्पितशल्याम् ।
विद्धधीरधिकनिर्निमिषाक्षी लक्ष्मणा क्षणमवर्त्तत तूष्णीम् ॥

इष्टेक्षणेन यथा तत्रैव—

गोविन्दं गृहमानीय देवदेवेशमादृतः ।
पूजायां नाविदत् कृत्यं प्रमोदोपहतो नृपः ॥

अनिष्टेक्षणेन यथा तत्रैव—

यावदालक्ष्यते केतुर्यावद्रेणू रथस्य च ।
अनुप्रस्थापितात्मानो लेख्यानीवोपलक्षिताः ॥

विरहेण यथा—

मुकुन्द ! विरहेण ते विधुरिताः सखायश्चिरा-
दलंकृतिभिरुज्झिता भुवि निविश्य तत्र स्थिताः ।
स्खलन्मलिनवाससः शबलरूक्षगात्रश्रियः
स्फुरन्ति खलदेवलद्विजगृहे सुरार्चा इव ॥

अथ व्रीडा—

नवीनसंगमाकार्य्यस्तवावज्ञादिना कृता ॥ ४७ ॥

दुर्गमसङ्गमनी ।

व्यवस्था यथा तादृशीत्यर्थः, तस्य स्वतन्त्रत्वात् ।

गोत्रं=नाम ।

शबलं मलदूषितं, देवाजीवी तु देवलः ।